

# HISTORY OF GREECE;

FROM THE

EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE CLOSE OF THE GENERATION  
CONTEMPORARY WITH ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

By GEORGE GROTE.

A NEW EDITION,  
IN TEN VOLUMES.—VOL. II.

NEW IMPRESSION.

WITH PORTRAIT, MAP, AND PLANS.

LONDON:  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET  
13-14,





## LIST OF PLANS

Vol. I.	Portrait of Arthur.
Vol. II.	Map of Greece.
Vol. IV.	(1) Malina Gulf and Thermopylae. (2) Battle of Salamis. (3) Battle of Plataea.
Vol. V.	(1) Battle between Athenian and Peloponnesian Fleet. (2) Battle of Amphipolis.
Vol. VI.	(1) Syracuse—operations of the ships. (2) Syracuse—when Demosthenes arrived.
Vol. VII.	Marches of the Greeks after the Battle of Ecnomus.
Vol. VIII.	(1) Battle of Mantineia. (2) Plans of Syracuse at the invasion of Dion.
Vol. IX.	(1) Battle of Ionia. (2) Asiatic Treasury of Darius.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME II

1000

PART I—LEGENDARY GREECE  
CONTINUED.

1994-1995 22

Downloaded from <http://www.sagepub.com> at Washington State University on May 12, 2015

Page	Page	Page	Page
1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28
29	30	31	32
33	34	35	36
37	38	39	40
41	42	43	44
45	46	47	48
49	50	51	52
53	54	55	56
57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64
65	66	67	68
69	70	71	72
73	74	75	76
77	78	79	80
81	82	83	84
85	86	87	88
89	90	91	92
93	94	95	96
97	98	99	100





CHAPTER XL—continued.

	PAGE
• Propositions of Watt, and a new question respecting the electric field—increased energy of a substance with pressure within from the heating.	10
The heat capacities and expansibility estimated, though somewhat imperfect. — Further — the effects of heating, long after the elements are . . .	11
The $\alpha$ of expansion of sulphuric acid, &c. — (continued) . . .	12
With the conditions of the air thick long time. . .	13
• Watt, on the possibility of producing the point of dewing, is naturally so in fact they were proved . . .	14
Agreement from the last letter . . .	15
When did the elements point begin to be visible . . .	16
Reasons for producing that they were had within about the middle of the second century . . .	17
• Condition of the fluid and of the dew in the case of . . .	18
• Application of the fluid to the case of the fluid . . .	19
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	20
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	21
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	22
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	23
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	24
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	25
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	26
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	27
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	28
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	29
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	30
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	31
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	32
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	33
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	34
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	35
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	36
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	37
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	38
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	39
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	40
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	41
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	42
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	43
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	44
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	45
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	46
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	47
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	48
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	49
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	50
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	51
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	52
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	53
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	54
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	55
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	56
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	57
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	58
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	59
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	60
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	61
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	62
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	63
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	64
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	65
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	66
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	67
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	68
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	69
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	70
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	71
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	72
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	73
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	74
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	75
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	76
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	77
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	78
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	79
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	80
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	81
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	82
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	83
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	84
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	85
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	86
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	87
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	88
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	89
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	90
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	91
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	92
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	93
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	94
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	95
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	96
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	97
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	98
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	99
• The fluid and the fluid . . .	100



CHAPTER II.

THE HALLS OF THE PEOPLE GENERALLY, IN THE EARLY HISTORICAL PERIOD.

PAGE	PAGE
1. The Halls generally—Description—The word used in connection with the Halls	134
2. Methods of approach—how built—General—1. Fellowship of Halls	135
3. Common language	136
4. Halls, language, identity of use, with a variety of Halls	137
5. Common religious observances, including such matters as religious and other social games	138
6. Halls of common resort in early history of the Halls	139
7. Halls—how as a social centre	140
8. Amplest—how as a social centre	141
9. Halls—how as a social centre	142
10. Halls—how as a social centre	143
11. Halls—how as a social centre	144
12. Halls—how as a social centre	145
13. Halls—how as a social centre	146
14. Halls—how as a social centre	147
15. Halls—how as a social centre	148
16. Halls—how as a social centre	149
17. Halls—how as a social centre	150
18. Halls—how as a social centre	151
19. Halls—how as a social centre	152
20. Halls—how as a social centre	153
21. Halls—how as a social centre	154
22. Halls—how as a social centre	155
23. Halls—how as a social centre	156
24. Halls—how as a social centre	157
25. Halls—how as a social centre	158
26. Halls—how as a social centre	159
27. Halls—how as a social centre	160
28. Halls—how as a social centre	161
29. Halls—how as a social centre	162
30. Halls—how as a social centre	163
31. Halls—how as a social centre	164
32. Halls—how as a social centre	165
33. Halls—how as a social centre	166
34. Halls—how as a social centre	167
35. Halls—how as a social centre	168
36. Halls—how as a social centre	169
37. Halls—how as a social centre	170
38. Halls—how as a social centre	171
39. Halls—how as a social centre	172
40. Halls—how as a social centre	173
41. Halls—how as a social centre	174
42. Halls—how as a social centre	175
43. Halls—how as a social centre	176
44. Halls—how as a social centre	177
45. Halls—how as a social centre	178
46. Halls—how as a social centre	179
47. Halls—how as a social centre	180
48. Halls—how as a social centre	181
49. Halls—how as a social centre	182
50. Halls—how as a social centre	183
51. Halls—how as a social centre	184
52. Halls—how as a social centre	185
53. Halls—how as a social centre	186
54. Halls—how as a social centre	187
55. Halls—how as a social centre	188
56. Halls—how as a social centre	189
57. Halls—how as a social centre	190
58. Halls—how as a social centre	191
59. Halls—how as a social centre	192
60. Halls—how as a social centre	193
61. Halls—how as a social centre	194
62. Halls—how as a social centre	195
63. Halls—how as a social centre	196
64. Halls—how as a social centre	197
65. Halls—how as a social centre	198
66. Halls—how as a social centre	199
67. Halls—how as a social centre	200
68. Halls—how as a social centre	201
69. Halls—how as a social centre	202
70. Halls—how as a social centre	203
71. Halls—how as a social centre	204
72. Halls—how as a social centre	205
73. Halls—how as a social centre	206
74. Halls—how as a social centre	207
75. Halls—how as a social centre	208
76. Halls—how as a social centre	209
77. Halls—how as a social centre	210
78. Halls—how as a social centre	211
79. Halls—how as a social centre	212
80. Halls—how as a social centre	213
81. Halls—how as a social centre	214
82. Halls—how as a social centre	215
83. Halls—how as a social centre	216
84. Halls—how as a social centre	217
85. Halls—how as a social centre	218
86. Halls—how as a social centre	219
87. Halls—how as a social centre	220
88. Halls—how as a social centre	221
89. Halls—how as a social centre	222
90. Halls—how as a social centre	223
91. Halls—how as a social centre	224
92. Halls—how as a social centre	225
93. Halls—how as a social centre	226
94. Halls—how as a social centre	227
95. Halls—how as a social centre	228
96. Halls—how as a social centre	229
97. Halls—how as a social centre	230
98. Halls—how as a social centre	231
99. Halls—how as a social centre	232
100. Halls—how as a social centre	233

CHAPTER III.

THE HALLS OF THE PEOPLE GENERALLY, SEPARATELY TAKEN.—GENERAL STATE OF POLYGRAPHY.

1. General state of Polygraphy	234
2. General state of Polygraphy	235
3. General state of Polygraphy	236
4. General state of Polygraphy	237
5. General state of Polygraphy	238
6. General state of Polygraphy	239
7. General state of Polygraphy	240
8. General state of Polygraphy	241
9. General state of Polygraphy	242
10. General state of Polygraphy	243
11. General state of Polygraphy	244
12. General state of Polygraphy	245
13. General state of Polygraphy	246
14. General state of Polygraphy	247
15. General state of Polygraphy	248
16. General state of Polygraphy	249
17. General state of Polygraphy	250
18. General state of Polygraphy	251
19. General state of Polygraphy	252
20. General state of Polygraphy	253
21. General state of Polygraphy	254
22. General state of Polygraphy	255
23. General state of Polygraphy	256
24. General state of Polygraphy	257
25. General state of Polygraphy	258
26. General state of Polygraphy	259
27. General state of Polygraphy	260
28. General state of Polygraphy	261
29. General state of Polygraphy	262
30. General state of Polygraphy	263
31. General state of Polygraphy	264
32. General state of Polygraphy	265
33. General state of Polygraphy	266
34. General state of Polygraphy	267
35. General state of Polygraphy	268
36. General state of Polygraphy	269
37. General state of Polygraphy	270
38. General state of Polygraphy	271
39. General state of Polygraphy	272
40. General state of Polygraphy	273
41. General state of Polygraphy	274
42. General state of Polygraphy	275
43. General state of Polygraphy	276
44. General state of Polygraphy	277
45. General state of Polygraphy	278
46. General state of Polygraphy	279
47. General state of Polygraphy	280
48. General state of Polygraphy	281
49. General state of Polygraphy	282
50. General state of Polygraphy	283
51. General state of Polygraphy	284
52. General state of Polygraphy	285
53. General state of Polygraphy	286
54. General state of Polygraphy	287
55. General state of Polygraphy	288
56. General state of Polygraphy	289
57. General state of Polygraphy	290
58. General state of Polygraphy	291
59. General state of Polygraphy	292
60. General state of Polygraphy	293
61. General state of Polygraphy	294
62. General state of Polygraphy	295
63. General state of Polygraphy	296
64. General state of Polygraphy	297
65. General state of Polygraphy	298
66. General state of Polygraphy	299
67. General state of Polygraphy	300
68. General state of Polygraphy	301
69. General state of Polygraphy	302
70. General state of Polygraphy	303
71. General state of Polygraphy	304
72. General state of Polygraphy	305
73. General state of Polygraphy	306
74. General state of Polygraphy	307
75. General state of Polygraphy	308
76. General state of Polygraphy	309
77. General state of Polygraphy	310
78. General state of Polygraphy	311
79. General state of Polygraphy	312
80. General state of Polygraphy	313
81. General state of Polygraphy	314
82. General state of Polygraphy	315
83. General state of Polygraphy	316
84. General state of Polygraphy	317
85. General state of Polygraphy	318
86. General state of Polygraphy	319
87. General state of Polygraphy	320
88. General state of Polygraphy	321
89. General state of Polygraphy	322
90. General state of Polygraphy	323
91. General state of Polygraphy	324
92. General state of Polygraphy	325
93. General state of Polygraphy	326
94. General state of Polygraphy	327
95. General state of Polygraphy	328
96. General state of Polygraphy	329
97. General state of Polygraphy	330
98. General state of Polygraphy	331
99. General state of Polygraphy	332
100. General state of Polygraphy	333



1014 J. Li et al.

**Stochastic Inequalities and Probability.**—EIN, LINDEN, and MURPHY.

[illegible]

2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352 2353 2354 2355 2356 2357 2358 2359 2360 2361 2362 2363 2364 2365 2366 2367 2368 2369 2370 2371 2372 2373 2374 2375 2376 2377 2378 2379 2380 2381 2382 2383 2384 2385 2386 2387 2388 2389 2390 2391 2392 2393 2394 2395 2396 2397 2398 2399 2400 2401 2402 2403 2404 2405 2406 2407 2408 2409 2410 2411 2412 2413 2414 2415 2416 2417 2418 2419 2420 2421 2422 2423 2424 2425 2426 2427 2428 2429 2430 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2436 2437 2438 2439 2440 2441 2442 2443 2444 2445 2446 2447 2448 2449 2450 2451 2452 2453 2454 2455 2456 2457 2458 2459 2460 2461 2462 2463 2464 2465 2466 2467 2468 2469 2470 2471 2472 2473 2474 2475 2476 2477 2478 2479 2480 2481 2482 2483 2484 2485 2486 2487 2488 2489 2490 2491 2492 2493 2494 2495 2496 2497 2498 2499 2500 2501 2502 2503 2504 2505 2506 2507 2508 2509 2510 2511 2512 2513 2514 2515 2516 2517 2518 2519 2520 2521 2522 2523 2524 2525 2526 2527 2528 2529 2530 2531 2532 2533 2534 2535 2536 2537 2538 2539 2540 2541 2542 2543 2544 2545 2546 2547 2548 2549 2550 2551 2552 2553 2554 2555 2556 2557 2558 2559 2560 2561 2562 2563 2564 2565 2566 2567 2568 2569 2570 2571 2572 2573 2574 2575 2576 2577 2578 2579 2580 2581 2582 2583 2584 2585 2586 2587 2588 2589 2590 2591 2592 2593 2594 2595 2596 2597 2598 2599 2600 2601 2602 2603 2604 2605 2606 2607 2608 2609 2610 2611 2612 2613 2614 2615 2616 2617 2618 2619 2620 2621 2622 2623 2624 2625 2626 2627 2628 2629 2630 2631 2632 2633 2634 2635 2636 2637 2638 2639 2640 2641 2642 2643 2644 2645 2646 2647 2648 2649 2650 2651 2652 2653 2654 2655 2656 2657 2658 2659 2660 2661 2662 2663 2664 2665 2666 2667 2668 2669 2670 2671 2672 2673 2674 2675 2676 2677 2678 2679 2680 2681 2682 2683 2684 2685 2686 2687 2688 2689 2690 2691 2692 2693 2694 2695 2696 2697 2698 2699 2700 2701 2702 2703 2704 2705 2706 2707 2708 2709 2710 2711 2712 2713 2714 2715 2716 2717 2718 2719 2720 2721 2722 2723 2724 2725 2726 2727 2728 2729 2730 2731 2732 2733 2734 2735 2736 2737 2738 2739 2740 2741 2742 2743 2744 2745 2746 2747 2748 2749 2750 2751 2752 2753 2754 2755 2756 2757 2758 2759 2760 2761 2762 2763 2764 2765 2766 2767 2768 2769 2770 2771 2772 2773 2774 2775 2776 2777 2778 2779 2780 2781 2782 2783 2784 2785 2786 2787 2788 2789 2790 2791 2792 2793 2794 2795 2796 2797 2798 2799 2800 2801 2802 2803 2804 2805 2806 2807 2808 2809 2810 2811 2812 2813 2814 2815 2816 2817 2818 2819 2820 2821 2822 2823 2824 2825 2826 2827 2828

**Topic and Discussion in Lectures in History**[illegible]

## CHAPTER 11

[illegible]

**0000000000000000**

### Power and Resource Management Tools

[illegible]

### UNITED STATES

Page	Page
200	200
201	201
202	202
203	203
204	204
205	205
206	206
207	207
208	208
209	209
210	210
211	211
212	212
213	213
214	214
215	215
216	216
217	217
218	218
219	219
220	220
221	221
222	222
223	223
224	224
225	225
226	226
227	227
228	228
229	229
230	230
231	231
232	232
233	233
234	234
235	235
236	236
237	237
238	238
239	239
240	240
241	241
242	242
243	243
244	244
245	245
246	246
247	247
248	248
249	249
250	250
251	251
252	252
253	253
254	254
255	255
256	256
257	257
258	258
259	259
260	260
261	261
262	262
263	263
264	264
265	265
266	266
267	267
268	268
269	269
270	270
271	271
272	272
273	273
274	274
275	275
276	276
277	277
278	278
279	279
280	280
281	281
282	282
283	283
284	284
285	285
286	286
287	287
288	288
289	289
290	290
291	291
292	292
293	293
294	294
295	295
296	296
297	297
298	298
299	299
300	300

## CHAPTER VIII

**Comments on Reading: Tutorials, Journals, and Assignments**

[illegible]





## Discussion

[illegible]

## CHAPTER II

1. **Introduction**  
 2. **Background**  
 3. **Methodology**  
 4. **Results**  
 5. **Conclusion**  
 6. **References**

126. phenomena, and poems of nature.	205	Roberts's new book, entitled the	275
The American Athens and Niagara along Niagara.	206	opening—an eloquent com-	
Appreciation of Adams by Andrew Richardson of the Atlantic by Stephen Richardson in North of Adams.	207	ment on its private value—	276
History of Adams (continued)	208	Proposed for publication in Britain	
before the publication of North	209	under the name of	277
Adams's Atlantic and Library of the great Republic	210	Madison made in its early	
History of the Adams—Law of Adams and Adams	211	career between the Atlantic	278
Industry and capacity of the ship	212	and the interest of a book—	
General review and summary of a large volume.	213	Adams's description of the	279
State of the nation, and prospects	214	the Atlantic, after it had	
and full commercial importance	215	been introduced to the con-	280
the subject of the Atlantic, and	216	dition of Adams—many	
the Atlantic, as evidence for the course of the	217	points of view maintained	281
History of the Atlantic—Atlantic	218	Adams is introduced to readers of	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	219	political conditions	282
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	220	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	221	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	283
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	222	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	223	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	284
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	224	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	225	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	285
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	226	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	227	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	286
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	228	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	229	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	287
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	230	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	231	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	288
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	232	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	233	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	289
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	234	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	235	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	290
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	236	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	237	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	291
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	238	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	239	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	292
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	240	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	241	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	293
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	242	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	243	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	294
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	244	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	245	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	295
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	246	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	247	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	296
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	248	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	249	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	297
the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	250	the Atlantic, and the Atlantic	
the Atlantic, and			



## CHAPTER XII.—continued.

	PAGE		PAGE
The interests of children and parents in early human civilization of	120	Early mode of writing and	121
language of such	121	These subjects discuss early	122
Development and evolution of	122	language, culture, and life	123
children and parents—	123	relation to the social order	124

# HISTORY OF GREECE.

## PART I.

### CONTINUATION OF LEGENDARY GREECE.

#### CHAPTER XL.

##### STATE OF SOCIETY AND MANNERS AS EXHIBITED IN GECIAN LEGEND.

THOUGH the particular persons and events described in the legendary poems of Greece are not to be regarded as belonging to the province of real history, those poems are nevertheless full of instruction as pictures of life and manners; and the very same circumstances which drive their composers of all credibility as historians, render them so much the more valuable as unconscious exposures of their own contemporary society. While probably describing an unscathed past, their compositions are lavishly and honestly borrowed from the surrounding present. For among communities, such as those of the primitive Greeks, without books, without means of extended travel, without acquaintance with foreign languages and habits, the imagination even of highly gifted men was naturally colored by the circumstances around them to a far greater degree than in the later days of Solon or Herodotus; unaccountably that the characters which they conceived and the scenes which they described would be that reality bear a stronger general resemblance to the realities of their own time and locality. For was the poetry of that age

Legendary  
poems of  
Greece  
thence  
pictures  
of real  
manners,  
though  
drawn as  
if from  
the  
past.

addressed to lettered and critical authors, watchful to detect plagiarism, and with simple imagery, and regarding something of novelty or peculiarity in every fresh production. To captivate their emotions, it was sufficient to depict with gaudes and fervour the more obvious manifestations of human adventure or suffering, and to clothe that type of society, both private and public, with which the hearers around were familiar. Even in describing the gods, where a great degree of latitude and deviation might have been expected,<sup>1</sup> we see that Homer introduces into Olympus the passions, the vapours, the love of power and patronage, the alternation of dignity and weakness, which animated the bosom of an ordinary Greek chief; and this tendency, to reproduce in substance the social relations to which he had been accustomed, would operate still more powerfully when he had to describe simply human characters—the chief and his people, the warrior and his comrades, the husband, wife, father, and son—or the imperfect rudiments of judicial and administrative proceeding. That his narrative on all these points, even with feelings character and events, presents a close approximation to general reality, there can be no reason to doubt.<sup>2</sup> The necessity under which he lay of drawing from a store, then happily unexhausted, of personal experience and observation, is one of the causes of that freshness and vivacity of description for which he stands unrivalled, and which constituted the imperishable charm of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* from the beginning to the end of Greek literature.

While therefore we recognise the idea of chronologising or historicising the events of Greek legend, we may turn them to profit as valuable memorials of that state of society, feeling and intelligence, which must be to us the starting-point of the history of the people. Of course the legendary age, like all those which succeeded it, had its antecedent causes and determining conditions; but of these we know nothing.

<sup>1</sup> And every body is full of the idea of the gods being anthropomorphic, the real object, as we say, of the idea, is the idea of the gods being anthropomorphic. Every one is full of the idea of the gods being anthropomorphic, and every one is full of the idea of the gods being anthropomorphic. (See the *Journal of the Royal Society of London*, p. 1, 17.)

There, there is no material difference of character between the gods and the men of the world, and the gods are the same as the men of the world, and the gods are the same as the men of the world. (See the *Journal of the Royal Society of London*, p. 1, 17.)

and we are compelled to assume it as a primary fact for the purpose of following out its subsequent changes. To conceive absolute beginning or origin (as Niebuhr has justly remarked) is beyond the reach of our faculties: we can neither apprehend nor verify anything beyond progress, or development, or *deus ex deo*—change from one set of circumstances to another, operated by some definite combination of physical or moral laws. In the case of the Greeks, the legendary age, as the earliest in any way known to us, must be taken as the initial state from which this series of change commences. We must depict its prominent characteristics as well as we can, and show—partly how it serves to prepare, partly how it forms a contrast to set off—the subsequent ages of Solon, of Pericles, and of Demosthenes.

1. The political condition, which Greeks legend everywhere presents to us, is in its principal features strikingly different from that which had become universally prevalent among the Greeks in the time of the Peloponnesian war. Historical oligarchy, as well as democracy, agreed in requiring a certain established system of government, comprising three elements—specialized functions, temporary functionaries, and ultimate responsibility (under some form or other) to the mass of qualified citizens—either a Senate or an *Ecclesia*, or both. There were of course many and varied distinctions between one government and another, in respect to the qualification of the citizen, the structure and efficiency of the general assembly, the attainability to power, &c.; and men might often be distinguished with the way in which these questions were deter-

Comparison of legendary with historical Greek government of the time.

<sup>1</sup> Niebuhr, *History of Rome*, Vol. I. p. 10. "Niebuhr sagt also, dass das Griechische politische System aus Aristokratie und Volksgewalt besteht. Beide sind, und beides ist, das Griechische politische System."—Niebuhr, *History of Rome*, Vol. I. p. 10. "Niebuhr sagt also, dass das Griechische politische System aus Aristokratie und Volksgewalt besteht. Beide sind, und beides ist, das Griechische politische System."

This is the description for the oligarchy and the democracy. "Niebuhr sagt also, dass das Griechische politische System aus Aristokratie und Volksgewalt besteht. Beide sind, und beides ist, das Griechische politische System."—Niebuhr, *History of Rome*, Vol. I. p. 10. "Niebuhr sagt also, dass das Griechische politische System aus Aristokratie und Volksgewalt besteht. Beide sind, und beides ist, das Griechische politische System."

school in their own city. But in the mind of every man, some dominating rule or system—something like what in modern times is called a constitution—was indispensable to any government entitled to be called legitimate, or capable of creating in the mind of a Greek a feeling of moral obligation to obey it. The functionaries who exercised authority under it might be more or less competent or popular; but his personal feelings towards them were continually lost in his attachment or aversion to the general system. If any despotic man could by violence or craft break down the constitution and render himself permanent ruler according to his own will and pleasure—even though he might govern well, he could never inspire the people with any sentiment of duty towards him. His sceptre was discredited from the beginning, and even the taking of his life, far from being sanctioned by that moral feeling which condemned the shedding of blood in other cases, was considered meritorious. Nor could he be mentioned in the language except by a name (*shen-mei*, *depo*) which treated him as an object of mingled fear and dislike.

If we carry our eyes back from historical to legendary Greece, we find a picture the reverse of what has been here described. We discuss a government in which there is little or no scheme or system,—still less any idea of responsibility to the governed,—but in which the main-spring of obedience on the part of the people consists in their personal feeling and reverence towards the chief. We remark, first and foremost, the King; next, a limited number of subordinate kings or chiefs; afterwards, the mass of armed freemen, husbandmen, artisans, freemen, &c.; lowest of all, the free labourers for hire and the bought slaves. The King is not distinguished by any broad or responsible boundary from the other chiefs, to each of whom the *Ubi Sine* is applicable if

not being prevented by supposing that either of these possible results was the primitive form from whence every race derived, even to the others. This is not impossible in the geography of periods and places, where this history can be proved by observation and modern historical data.

1. The Greek name *shen-mei* cannot be properly rendered *god*, for many of the instances by no means denoted to be an object, nor to be something which

the use of language is made of a gift and with which moral action. The word *shen* in the ancient language which we now mean to be, *shen* is in reality, should be simply that a man, and not some power that he could be held, while it does not appear a historical part of such power by some historical part. It is necessary only to suppose the full strength of feeling being within the original word *shen*.











communities, are exhibited in the movements of the legendary age as opportunities for advising the king, and media for promulgating his intentions to the people, rather than as restraints upon his authority. Unquestionably they must have exercised in practice to the latter result as well as to the former; but this is not the light in which the Homeric poems describe them. The chief kings, princes, or Gerontes—for the same word is Greek designates both an old man and a man of conspicuous rank and position—compose the Council,<sup>1</sup> in which, according to the representations in the Iliad, the resolutions of Agamemnon on the one side and of Hector on the other appear uniformly to prevail. The harshness and even contempt with which Hector treats respectful opposition from his constant companion Polydamas—the degrading tone and conscious inferiority of the latter, and the unanimous consent which the former obtains, even when quite in the wrong—all this is clearly set forth in the poem:<sup>2</sup> while in the Grecian camp we see Hector tendering his advice in the most deferential and delicate manner to Agamemnon, to be adopted or rejected as "the king of men" might determine.<sup>3</sup> The Council is a purely consultative body, unendowed not with any power of prescriptively arresting unwholesome resolves of the king, but solely for his information and guidance. He himself is the presiding (Booth-phoros or) member<sup>4</sup> of council; the rest, collectively as well as individually, are his subordinates.

We proceed from the Council to the Agora. According to what seems the received custom, the king, after having talked over his intentions with the former, proceeds to announce them to the people. The herald makes the word sit down in order,<sup>5</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> See Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212. Also, Iliad, II. 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

<sup>2</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>3</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>4</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>5</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>1</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>2</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>3</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>4</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>5</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>6</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>7</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>8</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>9</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.

<sup>10</sup> Iliad, II. 209, 210; Odyssey II. 211-212.





That is borne out by all that we hear of the actual practice,—  
 "The rule of many is not a good thing: let us have *one* ruler  
 only—one king,—him to whom Zeus has given the scepter and  
 the tetraktya scepter."<sup>1</sup>

The second book of the *Iliad*, full as it is of beauty and vivacity,  
 not only confirms our idea of the passive, voluptuous,  
 and hesitating character of the Agamemnon, but even presents  
 a repulsive picture of the degradation of the spirit of  
 the people before the chiefs. Agamemnon conceives  
 the Agamemnon for the purpose of immediately arming the  
 Greek host, under a full impression that the gods  
 have at last determined forthwith to crown his arms with com-  
 plete victory. Such impression has been created by a special  
 visit of Oenone (the Dream-god), sent by Zeus during his sleep—  
 being lulled an intentional fraud on the part of Zeus, though  
 Agamemnon does not suspect its deceitful character. At this  
 precise moment, when he may be conceived to be more than  
 usually anxious to get his army into the field and reach the  
 prize, an unaccountable fancy seizes him, that instead of arming  
 the troops to do what he really wishes, and encouraging their  
 spirits for this one last effort, he will adopt a course directly  
 contrary; he will try their courage by pretending to believe that  
 the days had become desperate, and that there was no choice  
 except to go on shipboard and flee. Announcing to Nestor and  
 Odysseus, in preliminary counsel, his intention to hold this  
 strange language, he at the same time tells them that he relies  
 upon them to oppose it and counterwork its effect upon the  
 multitude.<sup>2</sup> The Agamemnon is presently assembled, and the king of  
 men pours forth a speech full of dismay and despair, concluding  
 by a distinct exhortation to all present to go aboard and return  
 home at once. Immediately the whole army, chiefs as well as  
 people, break up and proceed to execute his orders—every one

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad*, II. 100. Agamemnon pro-  
 ceeds to make over to Achilles some  
 magnificent arms, with a body of  
 wealthy retainers (*Iliad*, II. 103)  
 and horses, &c. he sends him to the  
 Olympus to visit Athena and while  
 near him he Agamemnon would have dis-  
 appointed men of the host, thinking to do  
 in order to make room for him, Odysseus.

to the

*Iliad*, II. 103. Agamemnon pro-  
 ceeds to make over to Achilles some  
 magnificent arms, with a body of  
 wealthy retainers (*Iliad*, II. 103)  
 and horses, &c. he sends him to the  
 Olympus to visit Athena and while  
 near him he Agamemnon would have dis-  
 appointed men of the host, thinking to do  
 in order to make room for him, Odysseus.

<sup>2</sup> *Iliad*, II. 103. Agamemnon pro-  
 ceeds to make over to Achilles some  
 magnificent arms, with a body of  
 wealthy retainers (*Iliad*, II. 103)  
 and horses, &c. he sends him to the  
 Olympus to visit Athena and while  
 near him he Agamemnon would have dis-  
 appointed men of the host, thinking to do  
 in order to make room for him, Odysseus.

rushes off to get his ship about, except Odysseus, who looks on in miserable shame and amazement. The army would have been quickly on its voyage home, had not the goddess Minerva and Athina stimulated Odysseus to an instantaneous interference. He hastens among the dispirited crowd and diverts them from their purpose of retreat: to the which he addresses following words, trying to shame them by gentle expostulation: but the people, he finds with heads depressed and brows from his scepter,<sup>1</sup> thus driving them back to their seats in the agone.

Amidst the dissatisfied crowd thus unwillingly brought back, the voice of Thetis is heard the loudest and the loudest,—a man ugly, deformed, and venerable, but stout in speech, and especially severe and unsparring in his censure of the chiefs, Agamemnon, Achilles, and Odysseus. Upon this occasion, he addresses to the people a speech denouncing Agamemnon for selfish and greedy avarice generally, but particularly for his recent ill-treatment of Achilles—and he exhortations moreover to induce them to persist in their scheme of departure. In reply Odysseus not only rebukes Thetis sharply for his impudence in shaming the commander-in-chief, but threatens that if ever such behaviour is repeated, he will strip him naked, and thrust him out of the assembly with disgraceful blows, as an earnest of which he administers to him at once a smart stroke with the crumpled sceptre, imprinting its painful mark in a bloody weal across his back: Thetis, terrified and subdued, sits down weeping, while the surrounding crowd double him, and express the warmest approbation of Odysseus for having thus by force put the reveller to silence.<sup>2</sup>

Both Odysseus and Nestor then address the agone, sympathizing with Agamemnon for the shame which the retreat of the Greeks is about to inflict upon him, and urging emphatically upon every one present the obligation of persevering until the siege shall be successfully consummated. Neither of them animadverts at all upon Agamemnon, either for his conduct

<sup>1</sup> *Ilad.* 2. 122—124.

<sup>2</sup> *Odys.* 2. 261—263. *Ilad.* 2. 124—125.

<sup>3</sup> *Ilad.* 2. 124—125.



towards Achilles, or for his childish freak of trying the temper of the army?<sup>1</sup>

There cannot be a clearer indication than this description—so graphic in the original poem—of the true character of the Homeric age. The multitude who compose it are listening and acquiescent, not often hesitating, and never refractory,<sup>2</sup> to the chief. The fact which creates a presumptuous will, even where his violent reproaches are substantially well-founded, is plainly set forth in the treatment of Thersites, while the unpopularity of such a character is attested even more by the excessive pains which Homer takes to heap upon him repulsive personal deformations, than by the chastisement of Odysseus—he is lame, bald, crook-backed, of misshapen head and squinting vision.

But we come to wonder at the unmanly character of the Agamemnon, when we read of the proceedings of Odysseus towards the people themselves,—his fine words and flattery addressed to the chiefs, and his contemptuous reproof and manual violence towards the common man, at a moment when both were doing exactly the same thing,—fulfilling the express bidding of Agamemnon, upon whom Odysseus does not offer a single comment. This scene, which excited a sentiment of strong displeasure among the democrats of historical Athens<sup>3</sup> affords a proof that the feeling of personal dignity, of which philosophic observers in Greece—Herodotus, Xenophon, Hippocrates, and Aristotle—boasted, as distinguishing the free-Greek citizen from the slavish Asiatic, was yet undeveloped in the time of Homer.<sup>4</sup> The richest epic is commonly so filled with the personal adventures of the chiefs, and the people are so constantly depicted as simple appendages attached to them, that we rarely obtain a glimpse of the treatment of the one apart from the other, such as this remarkable Homeric scene affords.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* B. vii. 424. How does Thersites, in his satirical speech against Agamemnon, touch to any one upon this important point, through the circumstances under which his speech is made. It would seem to be of no value the more serious and the deeper developed the commander befall.

<sup>2</sup> How this character is the language of Odysseus, *Ibid.* viii. 492—501. Odysseus is particularly well adapted to this part of the story. He is a man of many names, and of many disguises.

<sup>3</sup> Xenophon, *Symposium*, i. 2, 4. <sup>4</sup> *Supra*, *Part* vi. 4, 1; *Plutarch*, *De Alex.* *cap.* at *de*, c. 25—27; *Herodotus*, vi. 124.



interesting picture completely harmonious with the brief allusion of Herod to the judicial trial—*deekition* : real trial—between himself and his brother Perata. The two brothers disputed about their paternal inheritance, and the cause was carried to be tried by the *chile* in agone ; but Perata bribed them, and obtained an unjust verdict for the whole.<sup>1</sup> So at least Herod allures, in the bitterness of his heart : earnestly exhorting his brother not to waste a precious time, required for necessary labours, in the unprofitable occupation of witnessing and shouting litigants in the agone—for which (he adds) no man has proper leisure, unless his inheritance for the year intended be safely treasured up in his garners.<sup>2</sup> He repeats more than once his complaints of the crooked and corrupt judgments of which the kings were habitually guilty ; dwelling upon abuse of justice as the crying evil of his day, and predicting as well as invoking the vengeance of Zeus to repress it. And Herod ascribes the tremendous violence of the autumnal storms to the wrath of Zeus against those judges who dispense the agone with their wicked verdicts.<sup>3</sup>

Though it is certain that in every state of society the feelings of men when assembled in multitude will command a certain measure of attention, yet we thus find the Agone, in judicial matters still more than in political, serving merely the purpose of publicity. It is the king who is the grand personal mover of Grecian heroic society.<sup>4</sup> He is on earth the equivalent of Zeus in the agone of the gods : the supreme god of Olympus is in the habit of meddling on his government with frequent publicity, of hearing some dissatisfied opinions, and of allowing himself occasionally to be wheedled by Aphrodite or worried into compliance by Hera, but his determination is at last conclusive, subject only to the ever-ruling interference of the Moira or Fates.<sup>5</sup> Both the society of gods, and the various societies of men, are, according to the conceptions of Grecian legend, carried on by the personal rule of

<sup>1</sup> Herod., *Opp.* 16. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Herod., *Opp.* 16. 25—26.

<sup>3</sup> Herod., *Opp.* 16. 26—27; Herod., *Idem*, *vi.* 362.

<sup>4</sup> Thucydides (*Characteristics* for title

*discovery* *Thucydides* *Characteristics* book 8 p. 102 gives the story of Helen, &c. and fragments of the tradition and language of the Homeric agone.

<sup>5</sup> *Iliad*, i. 185—202; ii. 20—21; *speaking* *the* *agone* *of* *the* *gods* *for* *142*.

a legitimate sovereign, who does not derive his title from the special appointment of his subjects, though he governs with their full consent. In fact, Greek law looked upon him as hardly anything else, except these great individual personifications. The state, or nation, is as it were absorbed into the prince: anonymous persons, especially, are not merely persons, but fathers and representatives nation, with the equivalent of that greater or less appogee to which he gives none.

But though in the primitive Greek government the king is the legitimate as well as the real sovereign, he is always constrained as acting through the council and agora. Both the one and the other are established and essential media through which his sovereignty is brought to bear upon the society: the absence of such assemblies is the test and mark of savage men, as is the case of the Cyclopes.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly he must possess qualities fit to act with effect upon these two assemblies: wise enough for the council, unfeigned eloquence for the agora.<sup>2</sup> Such is the ideal of the heroic government: a king not merely full of valour and resources as a soldier, but also sufficiently superior to those around him to secure both the deliberate concurrence of the chiefs and the hearty adhesion of the masses.<sup>3</sup> That this picture is not, in all individual cases, realised, is unquestionable; but the encomiasts as often predicted of good kings show it to have been the type present to the mind of the describer.<sup>4</sup> Ixionides, in his

<sup>1</sup> *Odys.* ix. 260.

<sup>2</sup> *Ilion.* i. 260. *Cyclops* *αὐτὸς ἄναξ*  
*ἡγεμὼν, αὐτὸς δαίμων.*

<sup>3</sup> *Odys.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

<sup>4</sup> *Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

<sup>5</sup> *Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

<sup>6</sup> *Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

<sup>7</sup> *Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

<sup>8</sup> *Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

<sup>9</sup> *Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

<sup>10</sup> *Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

<sup>11</sup> *Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

<sup>12</sup> *Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*

*Ilion.* i. 260. *ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*  
*ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν ἡγεμὼν*



been one of the essential conditions of its preservation.<sup>1</sup> Though the Spartan kings had the hereditary command of the military forces, yet even in all foreign expeditions they habitually acted in obedience to orders from home; while in affairs of the interior the superior power of the Ephors amply overshadowed them. So that unless possessed of more than ordinary force of character, they seem to have exercised their chief influence as guiding counsellors of the senate.

There is yet another point of view in which it behooves us to take notice of the Council and the Agora as integral portions of the legislative government of the Grecian communities. We are thus enabled to trace the employment of public speaking, as the standing engine of government, and the proximate cause of obedience, to the social infancy of the nation. The power of speech in the direction of public affairs becomes more and more obvious, developed and crystallizable, as we advance towards the culminating period of Grecian history, the century preceding the battle of Chaeroneia. That its development was greatest among the most enlightened sections of the Grecian name, and earliest among the more obtuse and stationary, is matter of notorious fact; and it is not less true, that the prevalence of this habit was one of the chief causes of the intellectual enervation of the nation generally. At a time when all the countries around were plunged comparatively in mental torpor, there was no motive sufficiently present and powerful to multiply so wonderfully the productive minds of Greece, except such as arose from the rewards of public speaking. The susceptibility of the multitude to this sort of guidance, their habit of requiring and enjoying the stimulus which it supplied, and the open discussion, embracing regular forms with free opposition, of practical matters political as well as judicial—are the creative causes which formed such conspicuous adepts in the art of persuasion. Nor was it only profound orators who were thus produced; didactic aptitude was formed in the

Employment of public speaking as an engine of government—connected with the political system.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Wille's Hist. Grecian*, book II. § 4. It seems that the Athenians looked off the heroic age as the age of the heroes, and attributed only to the heroes and demagogues. In this point the two

views followed by various other authors are striking. *Thucydides* (book II. c. 35, § 2) says that the Athenians were the only Greeks who were not influenced by the heroes, and that the heroes were not influenced by the heroes, and that the heroes were not influenced by the heroes, and that the heroes were not influenced by the heroes.



3. The state of moral and social feeling, prevalent in legendary Greece, exhibits a state in harmony with the rudimentary political fabric just described. Throughout the long stream of legendary narrative on which the Greeks looked back as their past history, the larger moral motives hardly ever come into play: either individual valor and avenging, or the personal attachments and quarrels of relatives and war-companions, or the feuds of private enemies, are ever before us. There is no sense of obligation then existing, between man and man as such—and very little between each man and the entire community of which he is a member; such sentiments are neither operative in the real world, nor present to the imaginations of the poets. Personal feelings, either towards the gods, the king, towards near and known individuals, fill the whole of a man's bosom: out of them arise all the motives to benevolence, and all the internal restraints upon violence, selfishness, or revenge; and special communion, as well as special excommunication, are essential to their existence. The ceremony of an oath, so imposing, so paramount, and so indispensable in those days, illustrates strikingly this principle. And even in the case of the stranger suppliant—in which an apparently spontaneous sympathy excite itself—the encounter and kindness shown to him arise mainly from his having gone through the accustomed formalities of supplication, such as that of sitting down in the shade by the sacred hearth, thus obtaining a sort of privilege of sanctuary.<sup>1</sup> That ceremony exalts him into something more than

1. The first step is to identify the problem.

1. **Introduction**  
 2. **Background**  
 3. **Methodology**  
 4. **Results**  
 5. **Conclusion**  
 6. **References**

magister, alij per totius reliquias  
et iurisdictiones suas, et per  
modum et potestatem suam in re  
publica, prout iudicaverint,  
habuerint et fecerint, etiam  
magister de Comptibus Ratis, et  
c. et c.

\* There are two major functions in the quantity and quality of resources in the real economy. A first group comprising education provides the process of human capital.

to the Institute of  
European Culture, the director has  
been an expert guide, he strongly  
recommended the Institute  
and to go to the Institute of  
European Culture, the director has  
been an expert guide, he strongly  
recommended the Institute

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 2000; 283: 2689-2693.

Thompson gave an interesting description of the death of the real Thelma, the one actually buried in the vault as a corpse of fraud. At the house of adoption, King of the Republic of Colombia. The wife of adoption having destroyed the latter law in England, just before it was passed, the wife of adoption was placed in the same, together with the mother, in this place, close by the commercial house, which was by the nature of the place. While on board, the adoption of the latter was made in the adoption of the latter, the mother of the latter was placed in the same, together with the mother, in this place, close by the commercial house, which was by the nature of the place.











The generous readiness with which hospitality is afforded to the stranger who asks for it; the facility with which he is allowed to contract the peculiar connexion of guest with his

host, and the permanence with which that connexion, when created by partaking of the same food and exchanging presents, is maintained even through a long period of separation, and even transmitted from father to son—these are among the most captivating features of the heroic society. The Hispanic chief welcomes the stranger who comes to ask shelter in his house, first gives him refreshment, and then inquires his name and the purpose of his voyage.<sup>1</sup> Though not inclined to invite strangers to his house, he cannot repel them when they spontaneously enter it craving a lodging.<sup>2</sup> The suppliant is also

supplication  
of a chief  
stranger  
and the  
suppliant

commonly a stranger, but a stranger under peculiar circumstances; who produces his own calamities and object conditions, and seeks to place himself in a relation to the chief whom he solicits something like that in which man stands to the gods. Courtesy as such would be very become to him, the chief cannot decline it, if solicited in the proper form: the ceremony of supplication has a binding effect, and the Hispanic people the heart-felt power who declines it. A conquered enemy may sometimes throw himself at the feet of his conqueror, and solicit mercy, but he cannot by doing so acquire the character and claims of a suppliant properly so called. The conqueror has free discretion either to kill him, or to spare him and accept a ransom.<sup>3</sup>

There are in the legendary narratives abundant examples of individuals who transgress in particular acts even the bounds of

humanity towards the poor and the help-

ful of 'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

The old and the new

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)

'Cárcel' (the old and the new)





a greater primary force than really belongs to them—their love, indeed, in a high degree, with reference to their own appropriate parts, but serving as a very imperfect compensation for the importance of the magnitude, and for the absence of any all-prevailing sympathy or sense of obligation between man and man. We best appreciate their importance when we compare the European society with that of barbarians like the Themas, who regarded their bodies, as the work of a process long-sold their children, for export as slaves—considered robbery, not merely as an allowable occupation among others, but as the only honourable mode of life—agriculture being held contemptible—and above all, delighted in the shedding of blood as a luxury. Such were the Themas in the days of Boudonard Theophrastus and the Hellenic society forms a mean term between that which these two historians yet saw in Themas, and that which they witnessed among their own civilized contemporaries.<sup>1</sup>

When however among the Hominids men we pass beyond the influence of the primitive law above enumerated, we find scarcely any other controlling force in operation. The acts and adventures enumerated imply a community wherein neither the protection nor the restraints of law are practically felt, and wherein ferocity, rapine, and the aggressive propensities generally were restrained by no internal counterbalancing scruples. Homicide, especially, is of frequent occurrence, sometimes by open violence, sometimes by fraud: usurpation for homicide is among the most constantly recurring acts of the Hominids; poison and savage brutalities are often resorted to, even in civilized houses, with apparent

Structure and organization of the Hominids were identical.

**Abstract**

affiliated with words responses were obtained (see Table 1). In a word, the majority of patients presented homophony *de* *monnaie* with *de* *monnaie*-time, and that this aspect of homophony is in direct or indirect consequence of homophony of *monnaie* or *monnaie* *de* *monnaie*.

The Union of Goodies, another major youth group, is participating in the literacy mission, proving that it really has continued long after the war.

The operation of the latter machine is described in the patent application for a ream of paper, filed by the applicant, June 20, 1890, and published by the Commissioner of Patents, May 15, 1891.

the Board.org, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons, v. 3.0, the results of the formation being of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

[illegible]

Figure 10.10: A plot of the function  $f(x) = \sin(x)$  for  $x \in [0, 2\pi]$ . The function is periodic and oscillates between -1 and 1.





image as well as for retaliation, between neighbouring tribes, appear ordinary phenomena;<sup>1</sup> and the established inevitability of hostile acts the only evidence of any settled feeling of obligation between one community and another. While the house and property of Odysseus, during his long absence, enjoy no public protection,<sup>2</sup> those unprincipled chiefs, who consume his substance, feel sympathy rather than disapprobation among the people of Ithaca. As a general rule, he who cannot protect himself finds no protection from society: his own kinsmen and immediate companions are the only parties to whom he may look with confidence for support. And in this respect, the representation given by Hesiod makes the picture even worse. In his emphatic denunciation of the fifth age, that poet deplores not only the absence of all social justice and sense of obligation among his contemporaries, but also the relaxation of the ties of family and hospitality.<sup>3</sup>











individuals, with boundaries both carefully marked and jealously watched,\* yet the larger proportion of surface was devoted to pasture. Cattle formed both the chief item in the substance of a wealthy man, the chief means of making payments, and the common ground of quarrels—breed and meat, in large quantities, being the constant food of every one.<sup>1</sup> The estates of the owners were tallied, and their cattle worked, mostly by bought slaves, but to a certain degree also by poor freemen called *Tithos*, working for hire and for stated periods. The principal slaves, who were entrusted with the care of large herds of oxen, swine, or goats, were of necessity men worthy of confidence, their duties placing them away from their master's immediate eye.<sup>2</sup> They had often slaves subservient to them, and appear to have been well treated: the deep and unshaken attachment of Eumenes the overseer and Philotas the shepherd, to the family and affairs of the above Olympus, is among the most interesting points in the account given. Slavery was a necessity which in that period of

them.

necessity might hold any one. The chief who conducted a frequenting expedition, if he succeeded, brought back with him a numerous troop of slaves, as many as he could want<sup>3</sup>—if he failed, because very likely a slave himself: so that the slave was often by birth of equal dignity with his master—Eumenes was himself the son of a chief, conveyed away when a child by his nurse, and sold by Phaulonius kidnapper to Leontis. A slave of this character, if he conducted himself well, might often expect to be enfranchised by his master, and placed in an independent holding.<sup>4</sup>

On the whole, the slavery of legendary Greece does not present itself as arising under a particularly harsh form, especially if we

\* *Iliad*, viii. 491, and 495.

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad*, i. 341, ii. 316, iii. 176.

<sup>2</sup> Olympus and other chiefs of Thessaly had some thirty oxen, *iv.*, 45; the greatest herd of fifty oxen, under the care of Leontius, *Odyssey* ix. 339, *ibid.* 340.

<sup>3</sup> Leontius, King of Boeotia, sold the *Odyssey* kidnappers—there is Phaulonius, a native Argive hero, called the *Odyssey* kidnapper, *iv.*, 45. The collection of the 300 parts of *Odyssey* would have placed his kidnappers in the front line.

<sup>4</sup> *Iliad* i. 341. *Odyssey* *iv.*, 45.

*Iliad*, viii. 37; *Odyssey* also *Odyssey* i. 341; *Odyssey* *iv.*, 45.

<sup>5</sup> *Odyssey*, *iv.*, 45; *iv.*, 45; see also *iv.*, 45. *Odyssey* has also a list of slaves, *iv.*, 45. The question put by Olympus to Leontius, in which the latter slave referred to in the *Odyssey*, indicates the systematic manner of slavery. "What the city of your father wanted? or were you seized by pirates when alone with your sheep and cows?" *Odyssey*, *iv.*, 45.

<sup>6</sup> Olympus had purchased a slave for himself, *Odyssey*, *iv.*, 45.





we are obliged to point out the decrease and loss of the early melody, we may at the same time note with pleasure the characteristic simplicity of manner: Rebecca, Rachel, and the daughters of Ishmael in the early Moslem narrative, as well as the wife of the native Macedonian chief (with whom the Turkish Pasha, master of Philip and Alexander, first took service on coming from Aragon) taking her own advice on the hearth,<sup>7</sup> exhibit a parallel in this respect to the Homeric manner.

We obtain no particulars respecting either the common freestone generally, or the particular class of those called Tuffos.

These latter, engaged for special jobs, or at the harvest and other busy seasons of field labour, seem to have given their labour in exchange for board and clothing: they are mentioned in the same line with the slaves,<sup>1</sup> and were (as has been just observed) probably on the whole little better off. The condition of a poor freeman in those days, without a lot of land of his own, going about from one temporary job to another, and having no powerful family and no social authority to look up to for protection, must have been extremely miserable. When Egeus indulged his expectation of being maintained by his masters, he thought of the same time that they would give him a wife, a house, and a lot of land, near to themselves,<sup>2</sup> without which collateral advantages, simple manumission might perhaps have been no improvement in his condition. To be taken in the service of a very poor farmer is noticed by Aristotle as the minimum of human hardship: such a person could not give to his Tithe the same ample food, and good shoes and clothing, as the wealthy chief Korymbachos, while he would exact more severe labour.<sup>3</sup> It was probably among such smaller companies, who could not advance the price necessary to purchase slaves, and were glad to save the cost of keep when they did not need slaves, that the Tithe found employment: though we may conclude that the brave and strong amongst these poor freemen found it probable to acquire some fluctuating stock, and



1000

11. *Chrysomelids* (Chrysomelidae) are the most diverse group of beetles in the Americas.

of *Medicago pratensis* is a seedling cluster derived in Germany, — the North Indian *Indo-himalayensis* cluster were brought into China, then modern wheat wheat were developed, primarily (Cao et al., 2002).



knowledge of the two former—since the habitual track, even of a well-equipped Adriatic trader during the Peloponnesian war, from Peloponnesus to Sicily, was by Eubœa and the Gulf of Tarentum. The Phœnicians, long afterwards, were the first Greeks who explored either the Adriatic or Tyrrhenian sea.<sup>1</sup> Of the Romans no knowledge is manifested in Homer, who, as a general rule, presents to us the names of distant regions only in connection with romantic or monstrous accompaniments. The Eritææ, and still more the Typhians (who are sup-<sup>Hydron, Typhians, Eritææ, Thes.</sup> posed to have occupied the western islands off the coast of Akkadania), are mentioned as skilful mariners, and the Typhians Minos professes to be conveying men to Tarsos to be there exchanged for copper;<sup>2</sup> but both Typhians and Eritææ are more considered than traders.<sup>3</sup> The strong sense of the dangers of the sea, expressed by the poet Æschylus, and the imperfect structure of the early Grecian ship, attested by Thucydides (who points out the more recent date of first improved shipbuilding which prevailed in his time), concur in demonstrating the then narrow range of nautical enterprise.<sup>4</sup>

Such was the state of the Greeks as traders, at a time when Babylon contained a crowded and industrious population with extensive commerce, and when the Phœnician merchant-ships sailed in one direction the southern coast of Arabia, perhaps even the island of Ceylon—in another direction, the British Isles.

The Phœnician, the Kananian of the ancient Jew, exhibits the type of character belonging to the latter—with greater enterprise and ingenuity, and less of religious exclusiveness, yet still different from, and even antipathetic to the character of the Greeks. In the Homeric poems, he appears somewhat like the Jew of the middle ages, a crafty trader turning to profit the violence and rapacity of others—bringing them ornaments, decorations, the finest and brightest products of the loom, gold, silver, electrum, ivory, tin, &c., in exchange for which he received landed produce, skins, wool and slaves, the only com-

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, l. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, *op. cit.* l. ii. 123. Minos, l. 2. 3. The Phœnicians of Tyrrhenia, although it is to be placed in Italy or Sicily, has been to Herodotus found among islands both ancient and modern.

<sup>3</sup> Odysseus, *op. cit.* l. viii. 119. *Hydron, Eubœa, and Hydruntum, Eritææ, Thes.*

<sup>4</sup> Herodotus, *op. cit.* l. ii. 123–124; Thucydides, l. ii.





The mode of fighting among the Homeric heroes is not less different from the historical times, than the material of which their arms were composed. In historical times, the Hoplite, or heavy-armed infantry, maintained a close order and well-ordered line, charging the enemy with their spears extended at even distance, and aiming them to close conflict without heaving their rank: there were special troops, bowmen, slingers, &c., armed with missiles, but the Hoplite had no weapon to employ in this manner. The heroes of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, on the contrary, habitually employ the spear as a missile, which they launch with tremendous force: each of them is mounted in his war-chariot drawn by two horses and calculated to contain the warrior and his charioteer; in which latter capacity a friend or comrade will sometimes consent to serve. Advancing in his chariot at full speed, in front of his own soldiers, he hurls his spear against the enemy: sometimes indeed he will fight on foot and hand to hand, but the chariot is usually near to receive him if he chooses, or to ensure his retreat. The mass of the Greeks and Trojans coming forward to the charge, without any regular step or evenly-maintained line, make their attack in the same way by hurling their spears. Each chief wears habitually a long sword and a short dagger, but he has two spears to be launched forward—the spear being also used, if occasion serves, as a weapon for thrust. Every man is protected by shield, helmet, breastplate and greaves: but the armour of

modern ages—i. e. implements and arms of steel, brass, wood, &c.—hills or no use of metals at all; nothing made of steel. 3. Implements and arms of copper and gold, or silver bronze and gold, without artificial colour. Articles of gold and silver are chiefly belonging to this age, but arms of silver, the only weapons of warlike, & this age which is not less interesting in its arms of iron, weapons of silver, and even those of copper. It is the last age of northern antiquity, immediately preceding the introduction of Christianity. (See the *Antiquities of the Jews*, pp. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.)

The Homeric age coincides with the period of the Iron Age. There is consequently some resemblance to Homer, while both bronze and gold

are familiar metals. Even the iron, and some employed only the ancient kind of iron, which is, however, to the modern of a different kind, in all, (Iliad, ii. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.)

The helmet, shield, spear, and sword, are the same mentioned by Homer, who appears to have been acquainted with the use, the form, and the purpose of the weapons. (Iliad, ii. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.)

The Iron Age, the Homeric, coincides the Christian, and only, period of their history in which the gold-silver, or iron, are absent of the way transportation of both (Iliad, ii. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.)

the child, is greatly superior to that of the common man, while the <sup>Indians</sup> themselves are both stronger and more expert in the use of their weapons. There are a few bowmen, as rare exceptions, but the general equipment and proceeding is as here described.

Such loose array, uncontrived as it is in the West, is familiar to every one; and the contrast which it presents, with those inflexible ranks and that irresistible simultaneous charge which bore down the Persian throng at Plataa and Marathon,<sup>1</sup> is such as to illustrate forcibly the great difference between heroic and historical Greece.

Contrast with the military array of historical Greece.

While in the former, a few splendid figures stand forward in prominent relief, the remainder being a more unorganized and ineffective mass—in the latter, these units have been combined into a system, in which every man, officer and soldier, has his assigned place and duty, and the victory, when gained, is the joint work of all. Free-will individual prowess is reduced externally shrank, if not wholly excluded—no man can do more than maintain his station in the line.<sup>2</sup> But on the other hand, the grand purposes, aggressive or defensive, for which alone arms are taken up, become more assured and easy; while long-sighted combinations of the general are rendered for the first time practicable, when he has a disciplined body of men to obey him. In tracing the picture of civil society, we have to remark a similar transition—we pass from Hæcuba, Thersites, Judo, Achilles, to Æneas, Pythagoras and Fabricius—from "the shepherd of his people" (so can the phrase in which Homer depicts the good side of the Trojan king), to the legislator who introduces, and the statesman who maintains, a permanent system by which willing citizens consent to bind themselves. If commanding individual talent is not always to be found, the whole community is so

Analogy drawn to military array and strategy.

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. in his military system does, indeed, describe the *diakroia* in the style of handling the spear as still preserved—*ἀνὰ τὴν ἀκρότητιν ἔχοντες καὶ ἐν τῷ θυμῷ ἐν ὁμοθυμαδὸν*. But he had *ἐκείνην* in common with the Persian array, of which he does not say and probably never did say anything but that they had introduced during the *αἰὶναι* *ἀνὰ τὴν ἀκρότητιν*.

<sup>2</sup> Thucyd. and Xenophon would attribute *ἐκείνην* to place of *ἀκρότητιν*.

Æneas, Æchylus (Æneas), *ἐκείνην* is a double exception, but it does not apply well to *ἐκείνην*, the use of the *ἐκείνην* of the *ἐκείνην* consisted in keeping the spear steady. However *ἐκείνην* is a double exception and the use of steady courage and self-sacrifice. But the *ἐκείνην* of *ἐκείνην* is the *ἐκείνην* of the *ἐκείνην* under the *ἐκείνην* of *ἐκείνην*.

<sup>2</sup> Thucyd. *ἐκείνην* *ἐκείνην*.



trained as to be able to maintain its order under inferior leaders; the rights as well as the duties of each citizen being predefinitely in the moral order, according to principles more or less wisely laid down. The contrast is greater, and the transition equally remarkable, in the civil as in the military picture. In fact, the military organization of the Greek republics is an element of the greatest importance in respect to the conspicuous part which they have played in human affairs—their superiority over other contemporary nations in this respect being hardly less striking than it is in many others, as we shall have occasion to see in a subsequent stage of this history.

Even at the most advanced point of their history, the Greeks would effect little against a walled city. Still less efficacious were the heroic weapons and army for such an undertaking as a siege. Fortifications are a feature of the age deserving considerable notice. There was a time, we are told, in which the primitive Greek towns or villages derived a precarious security, not from their walls, but merely from steep lofty and difficult slopes. They were not built immediately upon the shore, or close upon any convenient landing-place, but at some distance inland, on a rock or elevation which could not be approached without notice or scaled without difficulty. It was thought sufficient at that time to guard against piratical or marauding expeditions: but as the state of society became secured—as the chance of sudden assault comparatively diminished and industry increased—these protecting shades were exchanged for more convenient sites on the plain or directly beneath; or a portion of the latter was enclosed within higher boundaries and joined on to the original foundation, which thus became the Acropolis of the new town. *Thbes*, *Athens*, *Sagae*, &c., belonged to the latter class of cities; but there were in many parts of Greece deserted sites on hill-tops, still retaining even in historical times the traces of former habitations, and some of them still bearing the name of the old towns. Among the marvellous parts of *Eretria*, in *Elginæ* and *Phocææ*, in portions of *Mount Ida* and *Parosææ*, similar remnants might be perceived.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We visited sites in *Elginæ* (Hæc. lib. 2. 100), *Parosææ* (Hæc. lib. 2. 101), *Phocææ* (Hæc. lib. 2. 102), *Mount Ida* (Hæc. lib. 2. 103).

<sup>2</sup> *Constitutions* (Hæc. lib. 2. 104). *Acropolis* of the ancient city. *Acropolis* of the modern city is the only

Probably in such primitive hill villages, a continuous circle of wall would hardly be required as an additional means of defence, and would often be rendered very difficult by the rugged nature of the ground. But Thompson represents the earliest Orizaba—those whom he conceives anterior to the Trojan war—as living thus uniformly in undefended villages chiefly on account of their poverty, rudeness, and thorough carelessness for the morrow. Oppressed and held apart from each other by perpetual fear, they had not yet contracted the sentiment of kind abodes—they were unwilling even to plant fruit-trees because of the uncertainty of gathering the produce—and were always ready to fly, because there was nothing to gain by staying, and a bare subsistence might be had anywhere. He compares them to the mountaineers of *Albion*, and of the *Quaker* Indians in his own time, who dwell in their undefended hill villages with little or no inter-communication, always armed and fighting, and subsisting on the produce of their cattle and their woods—defied to undisturbed holes, and eating raw meat.

The picture given by Theophrastus, of these very early and unrecorded times, can only be taken as conjectural—the picture

Copyright © 2005, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

The use of *Phragmites* in coastal salt-water salinization control is discussed by J. H. Rhee, J. H. Rhee, and J. H. Rhee, *Phragmites*, p. 100. The use of *Phragmites* in coastal salt-water salinization control is discussed by J. H. Rhee, J. H. Rhee, and J. H. Rhee, *Phragmites*, p. 100.

Dear Mr. Chairman, Mr. Director and  
Members of the Committee, it is my  
pleasure to appear before you today to discuss  
the proposed changes to the Federal Reserve  
Act. I am a member of the Federal Reserve  
Board and I am also a member of the  
Federal Reserve Bank of New York. I am  
pleased to have the opportunity to discuss  
these changes with you. I will be discussing  
the changes to the Federal Reserve Act  
and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.  
I will be discussing the changes to the  
Federal Reserve Act and the Federal Reserve  
Bank of New York. I will be discussing  
the changes to the Federal Reserve Act  
and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Company also finds Gagg II, a 1954-55, who traces these arts and heavy findings, several among the most. Others, however, in the construction of houses, which after an extensive study, which had shown all the lower grounds and left only the surface.

**Figure 1**

This indicator of value depicts a person's life perspective in terms of values and beliefs. Values are the standards, principles, and qualities that are important to a person. They are the things that a person believes are important in life. Values are the things that a person believes are important in life. Values are the things that a person believes are important in life.

Called the district and its bordering villages and settlements of the area from the Caucasus, see *Thesaur.* p. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840

Book *Wings of Change*, published soon to be reviewed here, illustrates, in a way so readily accessible to the student, the flight with day—like a "butterfly" above, the nature of the world "open" to the eye. It is a volume of poems, songs and other literary fragments (Oxford, 1964, p. 182).

three indeed of a statesman and a philosopher,—generalized, too, in part, from the many particular instances of contention and expulsion of ships which he found in the old legendary poems. The Homeric poems, however, present to us a different picture. They recognize walled towns; fixed abodes, strong local attachments, hereditary individual property in land, vineyards planted and carefully cultivated, established temples of the gods, and splendid palaces of the chiefs.<sup>1</sup> The description of Theophrastus belongs to a lower form of society, and bears more analogy to that which the poet himself conceives as antiquated and barbarous—to the savage Cyclopes who dwell on the tops of mountains, in hollow caves, without the plough, without vine or fruit culture, without arts or instruments—or to the primitive settlement of Dardanus son of Erech, on the higher ground of Ilium, while it was reserved for his descendants and successors to found the holy Ilion on the plain.<sup>2</sup> Ilion or Troy represents the perfection of Homeric society. It is a walled spot, containing temples of the gods as well as the palace of Priam, and surrounded by walls which are the fibres of the gods; while the antecedent form of vulgar society, which the poet lately places as, in the parallel of that which the theory of Theophrastus carries to its own early semi-barbarous ancestors.

Walled towns serve thus as one of the evidences, that a large part of the population of Greece had, even in the Homeric times, reached a level higher than that of the *Attilians* and *Leleians* of the days of Theophrastus. The remains of Mykenæ and Tiryns demonstrate the many and Cyclopean style of architecture employed in those early days: but we may remark, that while modern observers were inclined to treat the remains of the former as very imposing, and significant of a great primary faculty, Theophrastus, on the contrary, speaks of it as a small place, and labours to shade the unknown, which might be deduced from its insignificant size, in

<sup>1</sup> Odys. ii. 31, respecting Menelaus, great king of the Frægiæans:

<sup>2</sup> *Ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἰσθμὸν ἔχοντα, καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν ὁρᾶν, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πόλιν, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγορᾶν.*

The character, also, of the great city of Ilium, in a notice of the city of Ilium, in the *Geography* of Strabo, vi. 1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

<sup>3</sup> Odys. ii. 100—103, 104, 105, 106.





it is sufficient here to repeat, that in the Homeric poems (long subsequent to Min's in the current chronology) we find poetry both frequent and told in honorable estimation, as Theophrastus himself emphatically tells us—remarking moreover that the vessels of those early days were only half-decked, built and equipped after the perished fashion,<sup>1</sup> in a manner upon which the nearest men of his time looked back with disdain. Improved and enlarged ship-building, and the trireme, or ship with three banks of oars, common for warlike purposes during the Persian invasion, began only with the growing skill, activity and enterprise of the Corinthians, three quarters of a century after the first Olympiad.<sup>2</sup> Corinth, even in the Homeric poems, is distinguished by the aspect of wealth, which it acquired principally from its remarkable situation on the Isthmus, and from its two harbours of Lechaon and Kenchreæ, the one on the Corinthian, the other on the Saronic gulf. It thus supplied a convenient connection between Greece and Italy on the one side, and the Asian sea on the other, without imposing upon the unskilled and timid navigator of those days the necessity of circumnavigating Peloponnese.

The extension of Grecian traffic and shipping is manifested by a comparison of the Homeric with the Hesiodic poems; in respect to knowledge of places and countries—the latter being probably referable to dates between B.C. 740 and A.C. 640. In Homer, acquaintance is shown (the accuracy of such acquaintance however being exaggerated by Strabo and other friendly critics) with continental Greece and its neighboring islands, with Eritre and the principal islands of the Ægean, and with Thracæ, the Troad, the Hellespont, and Asia Minor between Paphlagonia northward and Lycia southward. The Sicils are mentioned in the *Odyssæy*, and Sardinia in the last book of that poem, but nothing is said to evince a knowledge of Italy or the realities of the western world. Libya, Egypt and Phœnicia, are known by name and by vague journey, but the Nile is only mentioned as "the river Egypt;" while the *Indus* up is not mentioned at all.<sup>3</sup> In the Hesiodic

Homeric poems—  
the latter  
being in the  
Hesiodic  
poems, as  
improved  
upon  
Homer.

<sup>1</sup> Theophr. l. c. <sup>2</sup> of natural vessels. *op. cit.* pp. 31, 32, 33. He has  
approximated to the modern.

<sup>3</sup> Theophr. l. c.

<sup>4</sup> See Vossler, *Monographia Geogr.* by comparison with real facts, but the







Neither coined money, nor the art of writing,<sup>1</sup> nor painting, sculpture nor sculpture, nor imaginative architecture, belong to the Hæcætic and Hæcætic times. Such rudiments of writing arts, destined ultimately to acquire great developments in Greece, as may have existed in these early days, served only as a sort of medium to the fancy of the poet, to shape out for himself the fabulous creations ascribed to Hephæstus or Demetrius. No statue of the gods, not even of wood, are mentioned in the Hæcætic poems. All the many varieties, in Grecian music, poetry and dancing,—the former chiefly borrowed from Lydia and Phrygia—date from a period considerably later than the first Olympiad. Terpsichore, the earliest musician whose date is assigned—and the inventor of the harp with seven strings instead of that with four strings—does not come until the 50th Olympiad, or 575 B.C. : the poet Archilochus is nearly of the same date. The iambic and elegiac metres—the first deviations from the primitive epic strain and subject—do not reach up to the year 700 B.C.

It is this epic poetry which forms at once both the undoubted main prerogative and the solitary jewel of the earliest era poetry of Greece. Of the many epic poems which existed in Greece during the eighth century before the Christian æra, none have been preserved except the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* : the *Æthiopis* of Arcturus, the *Iliss Minor* of Lesches, the *Cyprian Verses*, the capture of *Ulysses*, the *Bæturia* of the *Æneid* from Troy, the *Troilus* and the *Epigoni*—several of them passing in antiquity under the name of *Homer*—have all been lost. But the two which remain are quite sufficient to demonstrate in the primitive Greeks, a mental organization unparalleled in any other people, and powers of invention and expression which prepared, as well as forboded, the future eminence of the nation in all the various departments to which thought and language can be applied. Great as the power of thought afterwards became among the Greeks, their power of expression was still greater ; in the former, other nations have built upon their foundations and surpassed them—in the latter they still remain unrivalled. It is not too

<sup>1</sup> The silver *talent* mentioned in the evidence of *Plutarchus* *Iliad*, is not, it shall prove, anything, being at the time when the *Iliad* was composed, still not coined.

such to say that this facile, emphatic and transparent character of the language as an instrument of communication—the perfect aptitude for narrative and discussion, as well as for stirring all the veins of human emotion without ever forfeiting that character of simplicity which adapts it to all ages and all times—may be traced mainly to the structure and the wide-spread influence of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. To us these compositions are interesting as beautiful poems, depicting life and manners, and unfolding certain types of character, with the utmost vivacity and animation: to their original hearer, they possessed all these sources of attraction, together with others more powerful still, to which we are now strangers. Upon him they bore with the full weight and solemnity of history and religion combined, while the charm of the poetry was only secondary and instrumental. The poet was then the teacher and preacher of the community, not simply the stirrer of their leisure hours: they looked to him for revelations of the unknown past and for explications of the attributes and dispositions of the gods, just as they awaited the prophet for his privileged insight into the future. The ancient epic comprised many different poems and poetical compositions, which fulfilled this purpose with more or less completeness. But it is the exclusive prerogative of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, that after the minds of men had ceased to be in full harmony with their original dæmons, they yet retained their surprise by the mere force of secondary excellences; while the remaining epics—though serving as food for the curious, and as storehouses for lexicographers, tragedians, and artists—never seem to have acquired very wide popularity even among intellectual Greeks.

I shall, in the ensuing chapter, give some account of the epic cycle, of its relation to the Homeric poems, and of the general evidences respecting the latter, both as to antiquity and as to identity.

The great  
and powerful  
element in the  
poem is the  
character of  
the Greek  
mind.

## CHAPTER XXI.

## GÆRICAN EPIQ.—HOMERIC POEMS.

At the head of the once abundant epical compositions of Greece, most of them unfortunately lost, stand the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, with the immortal name of Homer attached to each of them, embracing separate portions of the comprehensive legend of Troy. They form the type of what may be called the *heroic epic* of the Greeks, as distinguished from the *geographical*, in which latter species some of the *Homeric poems*—the *Catalogue of Women*, the *Helio*, and the *Hyperborea*—stood conspicuous. Poems of the *Homeric* character (if so it may be called, though the expression is very technical)—being confined to one of the great events or great personages of Grecian legendary antiquity, and comprising a limited number of characters all contemporaneous—made even approach, more or less successful, to a certain perfect unity; while the *Homeric poems*, minor in their spirit and unconfined both as to time and as to persons, strung together distinct events without any obvious view to concentration of interest—without legitimate beginning or end.<sup>1</sup> Between these two extremes there were many gradations. *Geographical poems*, such as the *Herakles* or *Thioda*, recounting all the principal exploits performed by one single hero, present a character intermediate between the two, but bordering more closely on the *Homeric*. Even the hymns to the gods, which pass under the name of Homer, are epical fragments, narrating particular exploits or adventures of the god commemorated.

<sup>1</sup> Arist. *Poet.* c. 25—27. He points out the *Homeric* and *geographical* poems, but he refers no notice of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as composed

of the same Homeric and *geographical* poems, but he refers no notice of the *Homeric* or *geographical*

Both the delicate and the mystic-religious poetry of Greece began in *Homerian* verse—the characteristic and conventional measure of the epic;<sup>1</sup> but they belong to a different species, and burst out from a different vein in the Greek mind. It seems to have been the more common belief among the historical Greeks that such mystic effusions were more ancient than their narrative poems: and that *Cypharus*, *Manius*, *Ulinus*, *Ulla*, *Pamphus*, and even *Hesiod*, *ho*, *ho*, the reputed composers of the former, were of earlier date than *Homer*. But there is no evidence to sustain this opinion, and the presumptions are all against it. These compositions, which in the sixth century before the Christian are passed under the name of *Cypharus* and *Manius*, seem to have been unquestionably post-Homeric. We cannot even admit the modified conclusion of Hermann, *Ulinus*, and others, that the mystic poetry, as a genus (putting aside the particular compositions falsely ascribed to *Cypharus* and others), preceded in order of time the narrative.<sup>2</sup>

Readers like *The Wind and Colony*, we reckon on the titles of about thirty lost epic poems, sometimes with a hint of their contents.

Concerning the legend of Troy there were five—the Cyprian Vases, the *Atreidae* and the capture of Troy, both *Atreidae* ascribed to Arctius; the *Lunar Hike*, ascribed to *Protesilaos*; the *Stations* (of the Hecuba from Troy), to which the name of Hecuba of Trachis is attached; and the *Telephos*, by Euphorion, a continuation of the Cyprian. Two poems—the *Thetis* and the *Epigoni* (perhaps two parts of one and the same poem) were devoted to the legend of Thetis—the two songs of that city by the Argonauts. Another poem called *Odipodia*, had for its subject the tragical destiny of Oedipus and his family; and perhaps that which is cited as *Euripia*, or *ruins on Euripia*, may have comprehended the tale of her brother Kalchres, the mythical founder of Thebes.<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract.** *Trachycephalus* s. str. has been shown to be a complex of at least 10 species, but the taxonomic relationships of the species are poorly understood. In this study, we used morphological and molecular data to examine the relationships of *T. cristatus* and *T. cristatus* group.

© 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675,

**Abstract**

The superior quality of Ceylon tea compared with those found in the rest of the world is the result of the unique conditions in the island.

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 283, 1999, 2533-2537.

The exploits of Hünichin were celebrated in two compositions, each called *Hünichin*, by Künichin and Pöweler—probably also in many others of which the memory has not been preserved. The capture of Götthala by Hünichin formed the subject of a separate epic. Two other poems, the *Älftunna* and the *Ningya*, are supposed to have been founded on other achievements of this hero—the effective call which he lent to the Dornenking Älftunna against the Lapithe, his descent to the under-world for the purpose of rescuing the imprisoned Thöfona, and his conquest of the city of the Ningya, the parental Oerthomman.<sup>1</sup>

Other epic poems—the *Pharida*, the *Danua*, the *Altamöndin*, the *Älftin*, the *Anastoria*<sup>2</sup>—we know only by name. We can just guess obscurely at their contents so far as the name indicates. The *Thöfomöndin*, the *Oggenomöndin*, and the *Corinthianen*, three compositions all ascribed to Hünichin, afford by means of their titles an idea somewhat clearer of the matter which they comprised. The *Thöfomöndin* ascribed to Hünichin still exists, though partially corrupt and mutilated; but there seems to have been other poems, now lost, of the like import and title. \*

Of the poems composed in the Hünichin style, diffuse and full of prologued detail, the principal were, the *Chöndagen* of Wunna, and the *Great Eddin*; the latter of which indeed seems to have been a continuation of the former. A large number of the celebrated women of heroic Greece were commemorated in these poems, one after the other, without any other than an arbitrary bond of connexion. The *Marriage of Kaya*—the *Melampölin*—and a string of fables called *Ättemöndin*, are further ascribed to Hünichin; and the poem above mentioned, called *Älftunna*, is also sometimes connected with his name, sometimes with that of Ekkegga. The *Nagallianen Versen* (so called probably from the first-verse of their author), and the genealogies of Künichin and Ättem, were compositions of the same rambling character, so far as we can judge from the scanty fragments remaining.<sup>3</sup> The *Oerthommanen*

<sup>1</sup>Waller, *Die Älftunna*, in *Die Götter*, p. 40–41, and *Die Älftunna*, in *Die Götter*, p. 42–43.

<sup>2</sup>Waller, *Die Älftunna*, p. 44–45, and *Die Älftunna*, p. 46–47.

<sup>3</sup>Waller, *Die Älftunna*, p. 48–49, and *Die Älftunna*, p. 50–51.

of *Pharida* the same with the *Älftunna*, in *Die Götter*, p. 52–53, and *Die Älftunna*, p. 54–55.

<sup>4</sup>Waller, *Die Älftunna*, p. 56–57, and *Die Älftunna*, p. 58–59.

<sup>5</sup>Waller, *Die Älftunna*, p. 60–61, and *Die Älftunna*, p. 62–63.





to be applied *only* to the worst, and then to imply vulgarity or common-place; the more so as many of the inferior compositions included in the collection seem to have been assignments, and their authors in consequence describable only under some such common designation as that of the *epicæ* poets. It is in this manner that we are to explain the disparaging sentiment connected by Horace and others with the idea of a *epicæ* writer, though to each sentiment was implied in the original meaning of the *Hein Ovid*.

The poems of the Cycle were thus mentioned in context and association with Homer's *Iliad* originally the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

[illegible]

This week's commentary suggests that it is only under the leadership of the Aho family that the country's political system will be able to survive, transcending the divisions of the constitutional crisis. Previous episodes of the 1990s election by lot are the (unintended) rule makers. There was not much relief in the time for those caught in the net. But people were more interested in the importance of optical events.

This statement, which is himself drawn up in the form of a personal appeal, emphasizes that he is not a Jew, but a Jew-hater. He repeats that he has never been an anti-Semite, as someone may suppose of him from his speaking the language of hatred of the entire world.

[illegible]

1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 26

[illegible][illegible]

The possibility of corruption in the Pipe Cycle could not have been more easily remedied, as suggested by the writer, by the use of a single pipe.



had both been included among them; and this abbreviation of the meaning of the word has given birth to a mistake as to the primary purpose of the abbreviation, as if it had been designed especially to part off the inferior epic productions from Homer. But while some critics are disposed to distinguish the cyclic poems too pointedly from Homer, I conceive that Wicksor goes too much into the other extreme, and identifies the cycle too closely with *nothing* at that point. He construes it as a classification, deliberately framed to comprise all the various productions of the Homeric epic, with its unity of action, and comparative poverty both of persons and adventures—as opposed to the Hesiodic epic, crowded with separate persons and peripeties, and destitute of central action as well as of closing catastrophe. This opinion does indeed coincide to a great degree with the best, inasmuch as few of the Hesiodic epics appear to have been included in the Cycle. To say that none were included, would be too much, for we cannot venture to set aside either the *Theogony* or the *Ergasteria*; but we may account for their absence perfectly well without supposing any design to exclude them, for it is obvious that their rambling character (like that of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid) forbids the possibility of interweaving them in any continuous series. Continuity in the series of narrated events, coupled with a certain degree of antequity in the poems, being the principle on which the arrangement called the Epic Cycle was based, the Hesiodic poems generally were excluded, not from any preconceived intention, but because they would not be brought into harmony with each other by reading.

What were the particular poems which it comprised, we cannot now determine with certainty. Wicksor arranges them as fol-

lows:—*Thronomachia*, *Panem*, *Amazons* (or *Aithis*),

*Olipoia*, *Thabala* (or expedition of *Amphimachus*),  
*Ergasteria* (or *Alkmanachia*), *Myra* (or *Phokada*), *Captura*  
 of *Odessa*, *Cyprian Vices*, *Iliad*, *Aithiopia*, *Latter*

*Iliad*, *Epipolis* or the *Taking of Troy*, *Return of the Heroes*,  
*Olympus*, and *Telamonia*. *Wicksor*, *Long*, and *Mr. Elphyn*

nevertheless it would be enough to say that the poems were arranged in the order of their principal and upon no other. The *Metamorphoses* might have arranged in the same order the first series of legends

in their premises. If they had chosen to do so, they would have published a separate book in the series. And they have in the series would have formed a Greek Cycle.

Critics enlarge the list of cyclic poems still further? But all such reconstructions of the Cycle are conjectural and destitute of authority. The only poems which we can affirm as positive grounds to have been comprehended in it, are, first, the series respecting the heroes of Troy, from the Cypria to the Telegonia, of which Proclus has preserved the arguments, and which includes the Iliad and Odysseum, the old Thebais, which is expressly termed cyclic<sup>1</sup> in order to distinguish it from the poem of the same name composed by Antisthenes. In regard to other particular compositions, we have no evidence to guide us, either for admission or exclusion, except our general view as to the scheme upon which the Cycle was formed. If my idea of that scheme be correct, the Alexandrian critics arranged therein all their old epic treasures, down to the Telegonia—the good as well as the bad; gold, silver, and iron—provided only they could be placed in with the narrative scenes. But I cannot venture to include, as Mr. Clinton does, the Eurypis, the Phocæan, and other poems of which we know only the names, because it is uncertain whether their contents were such as to fill that primary condition. Nor can I concur with him in thinking that, where there were two or more poems of the same title and subject, one of them must necessarily have been adopted into the Cycle to the exclusion of the others. There may have been two Theogonies, or two Hesiods, both comprehended in the Cycle; the purpose being (as I before remarked), not to sift the better from the worse, but to determine some fixed order, convenient for reading and reference, amidst a multiplicity of scattered compositions, as the basis of a new, entire, and corrected edition.

Whatever may have been the principle on which the cyclic poems were originally strung together, they are all now lost, except these two unvarnished diamonds, whose brightness, disparting all the rest, but alone sufficient to confer imperishable glory even upon the earliest phases of Grecian life. It has been the natural privilege of the Iliad and Odysseus, from the rise of Grecian philology down to the present day, to provide an intense curiosity, which,

The Iliad and Odysseus are the only poems of the cycle preserved.

<sup>1</sup> *Strabo*, *lib. xiv.* *Strabo*, *lib. xiv.* *Strabo*, *lib. xiv.* *Strabo*, *lib. xiv.* *Strabo*, *lib. xiv.*

<sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, *lib. xiv.* *Strabo*, *lib. xiv.* *Strabo*, *lib. xiv.* *Strabo*, *lib. xiv.* *Strabo*, *lib. xiv.*

even in the historical and literary days of Greece, there was no sound fact to which. These questions are the fragments of an age manifestly religious and poetic, but manifestly also unphilosophical, unreflecting, and unreasoning. The nature of the case forbids our having any authentic transmitted knowledge respecting such a period: and the lesson, must be learnt, hard and painful though it be, that no imaginable rack of critical reason will of itself enable us to discriminate fancy from reality, in the absence of a tolerable stock of evidence. After the numberless comments and antinomous controversies<sup>1</sup> to which the Homeric poems have given rise, it can hardly be said that any of the points originally doubtful have obtained a solution such as to command universal acquiescence. To glance at all these controversies, however briefly, would be to transcend the limits of the present work. But the most abridged Greek history would be incomplete without some inquiry respecting the *Poet* (as the Greek critics in their systematic denominated Homer), and the productions which passed, or have heretofore passed, under his name.

Who or what was Homer? What date is to be assigned to him? What were his compositions?

A person, putting these questions to Greeks of different times and ages, would have obtained answers widely divergent and contradictory. Hence the invaluable labours of Aristarchus and the other Alexandrian critics on the text of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. It has indeed been customary to regard these two (putting aside the *Hymns* and a few other minor poems) as being the only genuine Homeric compositions: and the literary man called *Chorizontes*, or the *Separators*, at the head of whom were *Teuchis* and *Helladicis*, endeavoured still further to reduce the number by dismembering the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and pointing out that both could not be the work of the same author.

<sup>1</sup> It is a remarkable illustration of that influence which has so much dignified the composition of literary men in all ages (I say we may admit as exceptions), that we find fragments which might be had scattered like the skin of a *Reindeer* and *Elephant*, with the most laborious scrutiny, but that we have too well the celebrated dis-

positions of contemporary critics and poets, to dispute what constitutes the real *opus* of Homer, *Int. p. 11*. But if thinking is allowed and various, contemporaneous as of antiquity, it is not possible to be so, depending on traditional ideas it is not only possible but is a difficult matter to find out what is the real *opus*.







the poem was merged. The compositions of each separate Homleid, or the combined efforts of many of them in conjunction, were the works of Homer: the names of the individual bard perished and his authorship is forgotten, but the contents gentle better lives and grows in course, from generation to generation, by the genius of his self-renewing song.

Such was the conception entertained of Homer by the poetical Homer, the poem called Homleid or Homleid; and in the general obscurity of the whole case, I lean towards it as the most plausible conception. Homer is not only tradition, the reputed author of the various compositions emanating from the gentle meadows, but also the recipient of the many different legends and of the divine genealogy, which it places their imagination to confer upon him. Such manifestations of fictitious personality, and such perfect incorporation of the contents of religion and fancy with the real world, is a process familiar and even habitual in the retrospective vision of the Greeks.<sup>1</sup>

It is to be remarked, that the poetical poem here brought to view, the Homleid, was of indisputable authenticity. Their existence and their considerations were maintained down to the historical times in the island of Chios.<sup>2</sup> If the Homleid was still unexpunged even in the days of Aristotle, Pindar, Hellanicus, and Plato, when their productive invention had ceased, and when they had become only guardians and distributors, in common with others, of the treasures bequeathed by their predecessors—for more exacted about their position have been three centuries before, while they were still inspired creators of epic novelty, and when the chance of writing seemed to them the undisturbed monopoly of their own compositions.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Given, a little earlier in Homer's "Iliad" passage, a descent of the line of the poetess to some God, was carried out by Pindar, to describe the line of the poetess, and there was still in the poet's mind, as Pindar, Pindar, p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> Pindar seems to have considered Homer as having been an historical personage, and that almost identical, Pindar, p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> Pindar, Pindar, p. 100, and Pindar, Pindar, p. 100.

<sup>4</sup> Pindar, Pindar, p. 100, and Pindar, Pindar, p. 100.

<sup>5</sup> Pindar, Pindar, p. 100, and Pindar, Pindar, p. 100.

<sup>6</sup> Pindar, Pindar, p. 100, and Pindar, Pindar, p. 100.

Now, then, is an individual man, but the divine or heroic rather (the ideas of tragedy and mystery combining, as they constantly did in the Greeks) surely of the genuine Homeric, and he is the author of the *Thebais*, the *Ergastis*, the *Cyprusian Times*, the *Proems* or *Hymns*, and other poems, in the most sense in which he is the author of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—meaning that these various compositions emanate, as perhaps they may, from different individuals numbered among the Homers. But the distinctness of the Homeric personality of Homer is quite distinct from the question, with which it has been often confounded, whether the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are originally entire poems, and whether by one author or otherwise. To us the name of Homer means these two poems, and little else: we desire to know as much as we be heard respecting their date, their original composition, their preservation, and their mode of communication to the public. All these questions are more or less complicated one with the other.

Concerning the date of the poems, we have no other information except the various affirmations respecting the age of Homer, which differ among themselves (as I have before observed) by an interval of 400 years, and which for the most part determine the date of Homer by reference to some other event, *scilicet* fabulous and unauthenticated, such as the Trojan war, the Return of the Hivvabab,

[illegible]

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

L. G. Hill and E. A. Smith, *Notes on the Ecology of the Coyote, in the Illinois-Indiana-Maryland Area*, 1950, p. 101, and footnote. In the Index of Diseases in the 5 Counties of Ohio.

[illegible]



the Ionic migration. Kraits placed Homer earlier than the Return of the Hēraklids and less than eighty years after the Trojan war: Herakleides put him 180 years after the Trojan war: Aristotle, Aristarchus, and Queser make his birth contemporary with the Ionic migration, while Apollodorus brings him down to 500 years after that event, or 240 years after the taking of Troy. Theophrastus assigns to him a date much subsequent to the Trojan war.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, Theopompus and Euphrastus refer his age to the far more recent period of the Lydian king Gygis (c. 640—620, s. c. 505—500), and put him 500 years after the Trojan epoch.<sup>2</sup> What were the grounds of these various conjectures we do not know, though, in the statements of Kraits and Herakleides, we may pretty well divine. But the oldest document preserved to us respecting the date of Homer—meaning thereby the date of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—appears to meet the case at the most credible, and the most consistent, point with the general history of the ancient age. Herakleides places Homer 400 years before himself; taking his departure, not from any fabulous event, but from a point of real and authentic time.<sup>3</sup> Four centuries anterior to Herakleides would be a period commencing with 800 B.C.; so that the composition of the Homeric poems would thus fall in a space between 800 and 600 B.C. We may gather from the language of Herakleides that this was his own judgment, opposed to a current opinion which assigned the poet to an earlier epoch.

To place the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* at some period between 800 B.C. and 775 B.C., appears to me more probable than any other

<sup>1</sup> Theophr. 1. 4.

<sup>2</sup> For the statements and opinions respecting the age of Homer, collected by Mr. Clinton F. Johnson, vol. I, p. 161, he gives the view of Aristotle, and places the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* a century earlier than I am inclined to do, 600—500 B.C.

Kraits probably placed the poet anterior to the Return of the Hēraklids, because the *Iliad* makes no mention of Heracles in Polyneices' death. Herakleides may be supposed to have grounded his date on the passage of the line which mentions the three generations descended from Atreus. We should have been glad to know the

grounds of the very late date assigned by Theopompus and Euphrastus.

The Pseudo-epic dates, as Kraits's of Homer, puts the birth of the poet not twenty years after the Trojan war.

<sup>3</sup> Theophr. 2. 22. Herakleides Ptolemaeus affirmed that Lykurgos had brought two Polyneices' sons the Arcadian poems, which had being long unknown out of Boeotia. The supposed speech of Lykurgos at Polyneices' death was employed by Aristotle's date here grounded by the Theophrastus; but Theophrastus respecting Lykurgos is too doubtful to serve as a witness in other inquiries.



separate and special, like that of the carpenter, the larch, or the prophet: his manner and connection must have required particular training no less than his imaginative faculty. His character presents itself in the *Odyssey* as one highly extended; and in the *Iliad*, even Achilles does not disdain to touch the lyre with his own hands, and to sing heroic deeds.<sup>1</sup> Not only did the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and the poems embodied in the Epic Cycle, produce all their impression and gain all their readers by this process of oral delivery, but even the lyric and choric poets who succeeded them, were known and felt in the same way by the general public, even after the full establishment of habits of reading among lettered men. While in the case of the epic, the recitation or singing had been extremely simple and the measure comparatively little diversified, with no other accompaniment than that of the four-stringed harp—all the variations superadded upon the original hexameter, beginning with the pentameter and iambus, and proceeding step by step to the complicated strophics of Pindar and the tragic writers, still left the general effect of the poetry greatly dependent upon voice and accompaniment and distinctly distinguished from mere solitary reading of the words. And in the dramatic poetry, the last in order of time, the declamation and gesture of the speaking actor alternated with the song and dance of the Chorus, and with the instruments of music, the whole being set off by imposing robes and decorations. Now both dramatic effect and song are familiar in modern times, so that every man knows the difference between reading the words and hearing them under the appropriate circumstances: but poetry, as such, is, and has now long been, so exclusively enjoyed by reading, that it requires an especial moment to bring us back to the time when the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were addressed only to the ear and feelings of a promiscuous and sympathizing multitude. Readers there was

the effect are largely interrupted. The earliest surviving Greek Epigrammatic collection, however, is ascribed by Pausanias (*Descript. of Greece*, ii. 12, § 10, 11), and the distinction between what is genuine and what is spurious depends upon editors, and very differently interpretable. Compare *Class. Journ.* for 1874, *Paris*, p. 231-234.

<sup>1</sup> Pausanias, *Descript. of Greece*, ii. 12, § 10, 11, also speaks distinctly of Achilles' harp, but ascribes it to the *Odyssey* (p. 12, § 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000).

A degree of individuality seems attached to the person of the bard, as well as to that of the heroic *Odyssey*. *Ibid.* 100-101.





by such a standard. Though they were not philosophers or scientists, it was their province—and it had been so long before the philosophical point of view was opened—to bring their poet home to the houses and emotions of an assembled crowd, and to penetrate themselves with his meaning so far as was suitable for that purpose, adopting to it the appropriate grace of action and intonation. In this their genuine task they were valuable members of the Greek community, and seem to have possessed all the qualities necessary for success.

These choruses, the successors of the primitive *Anchi* or *Enchi*, seem to have been distinguished from them by the discontinuance of all musical accompaniment. Originally the band sang, introducing the song with occasional verses of the simple four-stopped hexameter. In succession, the chorists, united, holding in his hand nothing but a branch of laurel, and depending for effect upon voice and manner,—a species of recited and rhythmical declamation,<sup>1</sup> which gradually increased in vehement emphasis and pathos, until it approached to that of the dramatic

<sup>1</sup> *Antiquities*, *Pericles*, c. 27; *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue for Dramatic Studies*, pp. 141, 155, which especially lay stress upon the *Enchi* and the *Enchirion*. Unfortunately the immediate point is not lost here.

The laurel branch is the badge of the singer or reader (for the two functions are often interchangeably used) to have been peculiar to the members of *Enchi* and *Enchirion*. *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, p. 141; *Pericles*, c. 27. <sup>2</sup> *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, *Pericles*, c. 27. <sup>3</sup> *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, *Pericles*, c. 27.

<sup>4</sup> *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, *Pericles*, c. 27. <sup>5</sup> *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, *Pericles*, c. 27. <sup>6</sup> *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, *Pericles*, c. 27.

<sup>7</sup> The original singing and reciting are preserved when, and where, it is necessary to use some unaccompanied recitation, as in the *Enchi* and *Enchirion*. <sup>8</sup> *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, *Pericles*, c. 27.

<sup>9</sup> *Antiquities*, *Pericles*, c. 27; *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, *Pericles*, c. 27.

<sup>10</sup> *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, *Pericles*, c. 27.

<sup>11</sup> *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, *Pericles*, c. 27.

<sup>12</sup> *Walter*, *Two Ages*, c. 100; *University Catalogue*, *Pericles*, c. 27.



Respecting the mode in which the Homeric poems were preserved, during the two centuries (or, in some slight, longer interval) between their original composition and the period chiefly preceding Euseb.—and respecting their original composition and subsequent changes—there are wide differences of opinion among able critics. Were they preserved with, or without, being written? Was the *Iliad* originally composed as one poem, and the *Odyssey* in like manner, or is each of them an aggregation of parts originally self-existent and unconnected? Was the authorship of each poem single-headed or many-headed?

At what  
time the  
Homeric  
poems  
began to  
be written

Either tacitly or explicitly, these questions have been generally coupled together and discussed with reference to each other, by linguists into the Homeric poems; though Mr. Pappe Knight's *Prolegomena* have the merit of keeping them distinct. Half a century ago, the acute and valuable *Prolegomena* of F. A. Wolf, tending to account the Vossian Scholia which had then been, recently published, first opened philosophical discussion as to the history of the Homeric text. A considerable part of that discussion (though by no means the whole) is employed in vindicating the position, previously maintained by Bentley amongst others, that the separate constituent portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* had not been cemented together into any compact body and unchangeable order until the days of Peisistratus, in the sixth century before Christ. As a step towards that conclusion, Wolf maintained that no written copies of older poems could be shown to have existed during the earlier times to which their composition is referred—and that without writing, neither the perfect symmetry of so complicated a work could have been originally conceived by any poet, nor, if recalled by him, transmitted with accuracy to posterity. The absence of any and convenient writing, such as must be indispensably supposed the long manuscripts, among the early Greeks, was first one of the points in Wolf's case against the pluriauthorship of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. By Hume and other leading physicians of Wolf, the connexion of the one with the other seems to have been accepted as he originally put it, and it has been considered incumbent on those, who defended the

Prolegomena of  
Wolf—  
which are  
essentially  
proving  
the  
unity of  
the poems  
by showing  
that poets  
wrote  
from the  
beginning









addition we have not to imagine that the same person did go through the whole. the recitation was essentially a joint undertaking, and the rhapsodes who visited a festival would naturally undertake among themselves which part of the poem should devolve upon each particular individual. Under such circumstances, and with such means of preparation beforehand, the quantity of verse which a rhapsode could deliver would be measured, not so much by the exhaustion of his memory, as by the physical sufficiency of his voice, bearing reference to the monotone, emphatic, and rhythmical pronunciation required from him.

But what guarantees have we for the exact transmission of the text for a space of two centuries by simply oral recital? It may be replied that oral transmission would hand down the text as exactly as is in point of fact it was handed down. The great lines of each poem—the order of parts—the *mos* of Homeric telling and the general style of diction, and for the most part, the true words—would be maintained: for the professional reciter of the *stasimela*, over and above the precision of his actual memory, would lend to *Homerus* his mind (if the expression may be permitted), and to preserve him within this magic circle. On the other hand, as respect to the details of the text, we should expect that there would be wide differences and numerous uncertainties: and so there really were, as the remarks contained in the *Scholæ*, together with the passages cited in ancient authors, but not found in our Homeric text, abundantly testify!

Moreover the state of the Hild and Odeyney in respect to the latter called the Duganua affords a proof that they were recited for a considerable period before they were collected to writing, inasmuch that the end

Argument  
from the  
fact that  
the  
Duganua  
exists.

<sup>1</sup> There are just rumors of life, based on the possibility that the Hmong people might have been persuaded to leave without military assistance. See, for example, *NY Times*, 10/20/81, p. 1.

—lat. *Arct. submarginatus* p. 47.  
 —margin. in the narrow sense of the  
 p. 47.—*Arct. submarginatus* p. 47.

colours, but not found either in the kind of Chinese. It is really to be desired, however, that many of these passages belonged to other open poems which passed under the name of Shuang. In fact, (see *Shuang* in this, p. 100) the names themselves vary little, and it is impossible with the state of the system of Shuang to co-ordinate with the words *Shuang*.

pronunciation underwent during the interval a double change.<sup>1</sup> At the time when these poems were composed, the *digamma* was an effective consonant, and figured as such in the structure of the verse; at the time when they were committed to writing, it had ceased to be pronounced, and therefore never found a place in any of the manuscripts—evidence that the Alexandrian critics, though they knew of its existence in the much later poems of Alkaios and Sappho, never recognized it in Homer. The letters, and the various perplexities of metre, occasioned by the loss of the *Digamma*, were surmounted by different grammatical stratagems. But the whole history of this lost letter is very curious, and is rendered intelligible only by the supposition that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* belonged for a wide space of time to the memory, the voice, and the ear exclusively.

At what period these poems, or indeed any other Greek poems, began to be written, must be matter of conjecture, though there is ground for surmise that it was before the time of Solon. If in the absence of evidence we may venture upon naming any more determinate period, the question at once suggests itself, what were the purposes which in that stage of society, a manuscript of its first commencement must have been intended to answer? For whom was a written *Iliad* necessary? Not for the *rhapsoists*; for with them it was not only played in the memory, but also interwoven with the feelings, and conceived in conjunction with all those flexions and intonations of voice, pause, and other oral artifices, which were required for emphatic delivery, and which the written manuscript could never reproduce. Not for the general public—they were accustomed to receive it with its *rhapsoic* delivery, and with its accompaniments of a solemn and crowded festival. The only persons for whom the written *Iliad* would be suitable, would

<sup>1</sup> See this argument strongly maintained in *Classical Review* Jan. 1870, p. 137, 138, 139. The modern Greek scholar particularly to be mentioned is the Berlin Aristarchist—Mr. Curtius, and his views are the basis of my own. The Alexandrian grammarians knew, as the modern scholar knows, not that *phi* was pronounced and written *phi*, which explains a strange error not committed by the help of written authority.

The same type of argument is taken by G. Müller, *History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, ch. iv. c. 10.

There has already been, in the same chapter, talk of the *rhapsoists* and *rhapsoists*, mentioned in the *Iliad*, who written in the *rhapsoic* style, and it is so great a mistake to suppose, that the spoken words for the rough *rhapsoic* style, to be so in the spoken style. None of these words is in reality.



of publication for use as modern poems not along their outside, yet the nearest approaching to the inside. It argued a new way of looking at the old special treasures of the people, as well as a thirst for new poetical effort; and the men who need formed in it may well be considered as leaders to study, and competent to criticize, from their own individual point of view, the written words of the Hæcætic chapbooks, just as we are told that Kallinos both noticed and collected the Thebais as the production of Homer. There seems therefore ground for conjecturing, that (for the use of this newly-formed and important, but very narrow class) manuscripts of the Hæcætic poems and other old epics—the Thebais and the Cypria as well as the Iliad and the Odyssey—began to be compiled towards the middle of the seventh century B.C.; and the opening of Egypt to Greek commerce, which took place about the same period, would furnish increased facilities for obtaining the Egyptian papyri to write upon. A reading class, when once formed, would doubtless slowly increase, and the number of manuscripts along with it; so that before the time of Solon, fifty years afterwards, both readers and manuscripts, though still comparatively few, might have obtained a certain recognized authority, and formed a tribunal of reference, against the carelessness of individual chapbooks.

We may, I think, consider the Iliad and Odyssey to have been preserved without the aid of writing for a period near upon two centuries.<sup>1</sup> But is it true, as Wolf imagined, and as other able critics have imagined also, that the separate portions of which these two poems are composed were originally distinct epical ballads, each constituting a separate whole and intended for separate recitation? Is it true that they had not only no common author,

<sup>1</sup> See, I think, Gœtze's *Homers Kunst*, vol. i. p. 10.

The Hæcætic poems were kept recited by druids, when writing was in introduction, or by other persons chosen for the purpose. See, vol. i. p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> See, *Homers Kunst*, Gœtze's edition, vol. i. p. 10. It is true that a tradition of recitation, or *Homeric*, was preserved, and that the Hæcætic poems were kept recited by druids, when writing was in introduction, or by other persons chosen for the purpose. See, vol. i. p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> See, I think, Gœtze's *Homers Kunst*, vol. i. p. 10. It is true that a tradition of recitation, or *Homeric*, was preserved, and that the Hæcætic poems were kept recited by druids, when writing was in introduction, or by other persons chosen for the purpose. See, vol. i. p. 10.

<sup>4</sup> See, I think, Gœtze's *Homers Kunst*, vol. i. p. 10. It is true that a tradition of recitation, or *Homeric*, was preserved, and that the Hæcætic poems were kept recited by druids, when writing was in introduction, or by other persons chosen for the purpose. See, vol. i. p. 10.

<sup>5</sup> The words of the Hæcætic poems were preserved, and that the Hæcætic poems were kept recited by druids, when writing was in introduction, or by other persons chosen for the purpose. See, vol. i. p. 10.









the theory another is. Pindar was a character not only materially different from what is indicated by Choeros and Pausanias—who represent him, not as having put together poems originally distinct, but as the inventor of an artistic order subsequently lost—but also in itself unimpeachable and inconsistent with Choeros' habit and feeling. That Pindar should take pains to reverse the license, or make up for the unfaithful memory, of individual rhapsodes, and to enable the Panathenæic festival by the most correct recital of a great and venerable poem, according to the standard received among the best judges in Greece—this is a task both suitable to his position, and requiring nothing more than an improved recitation, together with such adherence to it on the part of the rhapsodes. But what motive led him to bring together several poems, previously known only as separate, into one new whole? What feeling could he gratify by introducing the extensive changes and transpositions suggested by Lachmann, for the purpose of blending together various songs which the rhapsodes are assumed to have been accustomed to recite, and the people to hear, each by itself apart? Pindar was not a poet, seeking to interest the public mind, by new creations and combinations, but a ruler desirous to impart solemnity to a great religious festival in his native city. Now such a purpose would be answered by selecting, under the divergence of rhapsodes in different parts of Greece, that order of text which intelligent men could approve as a return to the pure and primitive *Iliad*; but it would be defeated if he attempted large innovations of his own, and brought out for the first time a new *Iliad* by blending together, altering, and transposing many old and well-known songs. A novelty so bold would have been more likely to offend than to please both the critics and the multitude. And if it were even enforced, by authority, at Athens, no probable reason suggests why all the other towns and all the rhapsodes throughout Greece should change their previous habits in favour of it, since Athens at that time enjoyed no political ascendancy such as she acquired during the following century. On the whole, it will appear that the character and position of Pindar himself go far to negative the fraction which Wolf and Lachmann put upon him. The interference presupposes a certain locksmen, and ancient aggregate, the main elements of which were familiar to the Greek





nothing to the poet; for until the *Iliad* was divided by Aristarchus and his colleagues into a given number of books or *stasimoi*, designated by the series of letters in the alphabet, there was no method of calling attention to any particular portion of the poem except by special indication of its subject-matter.<sup>1</sup> Authors subsequent to Ptolemy, such as Hesiodus and Plato, who unquestionably conceived the *Iliad* as a whole, use the separate functions of it by designations of this sort.

The foregoing remarks on the Wolfian hypothesis respecting the text of the *Iliad*, tend to separate two points which are by no means necessarily connected, though that hypothesis, as set forth by Wolf himself, by W. Müller, and by Lockmann, presents the two in conjunction. First, was the *Iliad* originally projected and composed by one author and as one poem, or were the different parts composed separately and by unconnected authors, and subsequently strung together into an aggregate? Secondly, assuming that the internal evidence of the poem requires the former supposition, and drive us upon the latter, was the construction of the whole poem deferred, and did the parts exist only in their separate state, until a period as late as the reign of Ptolemy? It is obvious that these two questions are essentially separate, and that a man may believe the *Iliad* to have been put together out of pre-existing songs, without recognising the age of Ptolemy as the period of its first completion. Now whatever may be the steps through which the poem passed to its ultimate integrity, there is sufficient reason for believing that they had been accomplished long before that period: the friends of Ptolemy found an *Iliad* already existing, and already ancient in their time, even granting that the poem had not been originally born as a *single* unity. Moreover, the Alexandrian critics, whose remarks are preserved in the Scholia, do not even notice the Ptolemaic revision among the many manuscripts which they had before them: and Mr. Payne Knight partly infers from their silence that either they did not possess it, or it was in their eyes of no great authority,<sup>2</sup> which could never

that the  
Library  
was where  
preserved  
copies of  
Ptolemy's  
edition,  
whether  
they were  
actually  
composed  
in their  
entirety.

<sup>1</sup> The *Homeric* *scholia* refer to  
Optimus, Chabot & c. (see especially  
Optimus, who was only one person of his kind,  
composed, as it is, & c.).

<sup>2</sup> Knight, *Palmyra*, *Homos*, 1700,  
1701, 1702. That Ptolemy's edition  
was a revised one, & c. (the *Iliad* to be pre-  
pared, their action good, & c.).









considerations of poetry (*Eposgenosse*) among other nations; and the German critics especially, among whom the description of literature has been most cultivated, have selected it as the only appropriate analogy for the Homeric poems. Such poetry, consisting for the most part of short artistic situations, with little of deliberate or far-sighted combination, has been assumed by many critics as a fit standard to apply for measuring the reputation of the Homeric age; an age exclusively of speakers, singers, and hearers, not of readers or writers. In place of the unsolicited admiration which was felt for Homer, not merely as a poet of detail, but as constructor of a long epic, at the time when Wolf wrote his *Prolegomena*, the tone of criticism passed to the opposite extreme, and attention was fixed entirely upon the defects in the arrangement of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. What was to be found in them of symmetry or prevailing system was pronounced to be decidedly post-Homeric. Under such preconceived anticipations Homer seems to have been generally studied in Germany during the generation succeeding Wolf, the negative portion of whose theory was usually adopted, though as to the positive substrate—what explanation was to be given of the history and present constitution of the Homeric poems—there was by no means the like agreement. During the last ten years, however, a contrary tendency has manifested itself; the Wolfian theory has been re-examined and shaken by Müntz, who, as well as O. Müller, Waidson, and other scholars, have revived the idea of original Homeric unity, under certain modifications. The change in Goethe's opinion, coincident with this new direction, is recorded in one of his latest works.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the original opinion of Wolf has also been reproduced within the last five years, and fortified with several new observations on the work of the *Iliad*, by Lehrsman.

The point is thus still under controversy among able scholars, and is probably destined to remain so. For in truth our means of knowledge are so limited, that no man can produce arguments

question raised by Wolf—*Eposgenosse*—*epic poet*—and applied to the Homeric poems.

Homeric unity, generally ignored by German critics in the last generation, is now again partially revived.

<sup>1</sup> In the 4th volume of his collected works, in the 10th lecture "Homer, nach demselben" (München, 1840), p. 41.



better informed than we are, except in as far as they could profit by the analogies of the cyclic and other epic poems, which would doubtless in many cases have afforded valuable aid.

Nevertheless no classical scholar can be away without some opinion respecting the authorship of these Homeric poems. And the more defective the evidence we possess, the more essential is it that all that evidence should be marshalled in the clearest order, and its bearing upon the points in controversy distinctly understood beforehand. Both these conditions seem to have been often neglected, throughout the long-continued Homeric discussion.

To illustrate the first point.—Since two poems are comprehended in the problem to be solved, the natural process would be, first to study the matter of the two, and then, to apply the conclusions thence deduced as a means of explaining the other. Now the *Odyssey*, looking at its aggregate character, is incomparably more easy to comprehend than the *Iliad*. Yet most Homeric critics apply the microscope at once, and in the first instance, to the *Iliad*.

To illustrate the second point.—What evidence is sufficient to negative the supposition that the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* is a poem originally and intentionally one? Not simply particular gaps and contradictions, though they be even gross and numerous; but the preponderance of those proofs of means unprepared coincidence over the other proofs of designed adaptation scattered throughout the whole poem. For the poet (or the co-operating poets, if more than one) may have intended to compose a harmonious whole, but may have realised their intention incompletely, and left partial faultiness or perhaps the contradictory lines may have crept in through a corrupt text. A survey of the whole poem is necessary to determine the question; and this, normally, too, has not always been attempted to.

Had it happened that the *Odyssey* had been preserved to us alone, without the *Iliad*, I think the dispute respecting Homeric unity would never have been raised. For the former is, in my judgment, pervaded almost from beginning to end by marks of designed adaptation; and the special faults which Wolf, W.

Method of solving the question of Homeric unity.

Miller, and B. Tietze,<sup>1</sup> have singled out for the purpose of disproving such want of intention, one or two and of no little importance, that they would have been unanimously regarded as mere instances of bias or unfairness on the part of the poet, had they not been seconded by the far more powerful battery opened against the *Iliad*. These critics, having laid down their general presumptions against the integrity of the long epics, illustrate their principles by exposing the many flaws and defects in the *Iliad*, and then think it sufficient if they can show a few similar defects in the *Odyssey*—as if the breaking up of *Homer's* unity in the former actually created a similar necessity with regard to the latter; and their method of proceeding, contrary to the rule above laid down, puts the more difficult problem in the foreground, as a means of solution for the easier. We can hardly wonder, however, that they have applied their observations in the first instance to the *Iliad*, because it is in every man's esteem the

*Odyssey* to be treated thus, as of much stronger and more obvious character than the *Iliad*.

more marked, striking and impressive poem of the two—and the character of *Homer* is more intimately identified with it than with the *Odyssey*. This may serve as an explanation of the course pursued; but in the case as it may in respect to comparative poetical merit, it is not the less true, that as an aggregate, the

*Odyssey* is more simple and easily understood, and therefore ought to come first in the order of analysis.

Now, looking at the *Odyssey* by itself, the proofs of a unity of design seem unequalled and everywhere to be found. A generalised structure, and a concentration of interest upon one point here under well-defined circumstances, may be traced from the first book to the twenty-third. *Odysseus* is always either directly or indirectly kept before the reader, as a warrior returning from the fallow of glory at Troy, exposed to manifold and protracted misfortune during his return home, on which his whole soul is bent that he refuse even the immortality offered by *Calypso*—a victim, moreover, even after his return, to ungodly and unrighteous men, who have long been plundering his property and dishonouring his house; but at length obtaining, by

<sup>1</sup> *Reprint of Tietze's, Tietze's Collection and Tietze's, des Homer (Hilfen zum, 1888, Strassburg, p. 4-48)*

valour and cunning united, a signal revenge which restores him to all that he had lost. All the persons and all the events in the poem are subsidiary to this main plot: and the divine agency, necessary to satisfy the feeling of the Homeric man, is put forth by Peneleos and Atreus, in both cases from dispositions directly bearing upon Odysseus. To appreciate the unity of the *Odyssey*, we have only to read the objections taken against that of the *Iliad*—especially in regard to the long withdrawal of Achilles, not only from the scene, but from the memory—together with the independent prominence of Ajax, Diomedes and other heroes. Even so, we are entitled from hence to take the want of pre-destinated unity in the *Iliad*, will be presently considered; but it is certain that the constitution of the *Odyssey* in this respect everywhere demonstrates the presence of such unity. Whatever may be the interest attached to Peneleos, Telemachus, or Eumæus, we never dis-junct them from their association with Odysseus. The present is not the place for collecting the many modes of artistic structure dispersed throughout this poem: but it may be worth while to remark, that the final catastrophe realised in the twenty-second book—the slaughter of the suitors in the very house which they were profaning—is distinctly and prominently marked out in the first and second books, promised by Telemachus in the eleventh, by Atreus in the thirteenth, and by Helen in the fifteenth, and gradually matured by a series of suitable premisses, throughout the eight books preceding its occurrence.<sup>1</sup> Indeed what is principally evident, and what has been often noticed, in the *Odyssey*, is, the admirable flow both of the narrative and the events; the absence of that rise and fall of interest which is sufficiently conspicuous in the *Iliad*.

To set against these witnesses of unity, there ought at least to be some strong cases produced of occasional incoherence or contradiction. But it is remarkable how little of such counter-evidence is to be found, although the arguments of Wolf, W. Müller, and H. Thiersch stand in ~~strong~~ need of it. They have discovered only one instance of palpable inconsistency in the poem—the number of days occupied by the absence of Telemachus at Pylos and

Telemachus  
only two  
and so of  
inconsistency  
of dates  
shown.

<sup>1</sup> *Odyssey* i. 325; ii. 228 & onward see *Index*, *Index* *Index* *Index*, vi. 122; viii. 174; ix. 179; also viii. 122.



uninterrupted meeting and recognition takes place under the roof of Eumæus—not one *any* epic poem ever have described that meeting and recognition without giving some account how Odysseus came thither. Moreover the first two books of the *Odyssey* detour by the ground, and carry recognition forward, to the final recognition of the poem—treating Telemachus as a subordinate person, and his expedition as merely provisional towards an ulterior result. Nor can I agree with W. Miller, that the real *Odyssey* might well be supposed to begin with the fifth book. On the contrary, the abduction of the suitors and the Ithacæan epics, presented to us in the second book, is absolutely essential to the full comprehension of the books subsequent to the thirtieth. The suitors are for two important passages in the poem to allow of their being first introduced in so informal a manner as we read in the sixteenth book: (naked the peering divisions of Athalia (xix. 246, 277) and Eumæus (xix. 41, 55) to the suitors, prepossessing experiences of them on the part of the hosts).

Lastly, the twofold discussion of the gods, at the beginning of the first and fifth books, and the double interference of Athalia, far from being a needless repetition, may be shown to suit perfectly both the generic equal conditions and the unity of the poem.<sup>1</sup> For although the final consummation, and the expiation of measures against the suitors, was to be accomplished by Odysseus and Telemachus jointly, yet the march and adventures of the two, until the moment of their meeting in the dwelling of Eumæus, were essentially distinct. But according to the religious ideas of the old epic, the presiding direction of Athalia was necessary for the safety and success of both of them. Her first interference arouses and inspires the son, her second produces the liberation of the father—constituting a point of union and common origin for two lines of adventure in both of which she takes warm interest, but which are necessary for a time kept apart in order to coincide at the proper moment.

Double  
and  
double  
interference  
of  
Athalia,  
the  
first  
of  
the  
Odyssey.

<sup>1</sup> W. Miller, in attempting to explain that in the first century of the epic, there is a generic condition which is due to the progress. How does not provide to suit Homer's intention

to Odysseus, in the first book, through Athalia, which also to do so. Epic, indeed, produces to be equal, while before the Athalia to Odysseus the return of Odysseus, but he had



It will thus appear that the twice-repeated agent of the poem in the *Odyssey*, bringing home as it does to one and the same divine agent that double end which is essential to the scheme of the poem, comports better with the suggestion of promediated scenes, easily than with that of distinct self-existent parts. <sup>(1901)</sup> And naturally the manner in which Telemachus and <sup>(1902)</sup> by his son. Odysseus, both by different roads, are brought into meeting and conjunction, at the dwelling of Eumæus, is something not only contrived, but very skillfully contrived. It is needless to stress to the highly interesting character of Eumæus, rendered available as a rallying point, though in different ways, both to the father and the son, over and above the sympathy which he himself inspires.

If the *Odyssey* be not an original unity, of what self-existent parts can we imagine it to have consisted? To this question it is difficult to imagine a satisfactory reply: for the suggestion that Telemachus and his adventures may once have formed the subject of a separate epic, apart from Odysseus, appears inconsistent with the whole character of that youth as it stands in the poem, and with the events in which he is made to take part. We could better imagine the distribution of the adventures of Odysseus himself into two parts—one including his wanderings and return, the other handling his ill-treatment by the suitors and his final triumph. But though either of these two subjects might have been adequate to furnish out a separate poem, it is nevertheless certain, that as they are presented in the *Odyssey*, the former cannot be divorced from the latter. The simple return of Odysseus, as it now stands in the poem, could act only as one in a final close, so long as the suitors remain in possession of his house and feasted his resources with his wife. Any poem which treated his wanderings and return separately, must have represented his reunion with Penelope and restoration to his home as following naturally upon his arrival in Ithaca—thus taking little or no notice of the suitors. But this would be a capital misapprehension of the actual epic narrative, which considers the suitors at home as an essential portion of the destiny of the wreck-wrecker hero,

already betrayed by the fact both that <sup>(1903)</sup> him, because of the weak material for his great difficulty, presenting the agent has to Eumæus.

not less than his shipwreck and trials at sea. His return (especially taken) is foreboded, according to the name of Polyphemos granted by Poseidon, to be long-extended, miserable, solitary and ending with destruction in his home to great pain;<sup>1</sup> and the ground is thus laid, as the way opened to his wanderings, for a new series of events which are to happen to him after his arrival in Ithaca. There is no trouble-happening between the departure of Odysseus from Troy and the final restoration to his home and his wife. The distance between these two events may indeed be widened, by introducing new distresses and impediments, but any explicit portion of it cannot be otherwise treated than as a fraction of the whole. The beginning and end are here the data in respect to special genres, though the intermediate events admit of being conceived as variables, more or less numerous: so that the conception of the whole may be said without impropriety both to precede and to govern that of the constituent parts.

The general result of a study of the *Odyssey* may be set down as follows:—1. The poem as it now stands exhibits unexceptionally adaptation of parts and continuity of structure, whether by one or by several consecutive hands: it may perhaps be a secondary formation, one of a pre-existing *Odyssey* of smaller dimensions; but if so, the parts of the smaller whole must have been so far revised as to make them suitable members of the larger, and are now recognizable by us. 2. The subject-matter of the poem not only does not favour, but goes far to exclude, the possibility of the Welfan hypothesis. Its events must be so arranged as to have composed several antediluvian satiric epics, afterwards put together into the present aggregate. Its authors cannot have been mere compilers of pre-existing materials, such as Pindaricus and his friends: they must have been poets, competent to work such matter as they found into a new and enlarged design of their own. Nor can the age in which this long poem, of so many thousand lines, was turned ~~into~~ a continuous aggregate, be separated from the ancient tradition of, varied use of, Greek epics.

100

**Study for discussion class**

**1944** **1945** **1946** **1947** **1948** **1949** **1950** **1951** **1952** **1953** **1954** **1955** **1956** **1957** **1958** **1959** **1960** **1961** **1962** **1963** **1964** **1965** **1966** **1967** **1968** **1969** **1970** **1971** **1972** **1973** **1974** **1975** **1976** **1977** **1978** **1979** **1980** **1981** **1982** **1983** **1984** **1985** **1986** **1987** **1988** **1989** **1990** **1991** **1992** **1993** **1994** **1995** **1996** **1997** **1998** **1999** **2000** **2001** **2002** **2003** **2004** **2005** **2006** **2007** **2008** **2009** **2010** **2011** **2012** **2013** **2014** **2015** **2016** **2017** **2018** **2019** **2020** **2021** **2022** **2023** **2024** **2025** **2026** **2027** **2028** **2029** **2030** **2031** **2032** **2033** **2034** **2035** **2036** **2037** **2038** **2039** **2040** **2041** **2042** **2043** **2044** **2045** **2046** **2047** **2048** **2049** **2050** **2051** **2052** **2053** **2054** **2055** **2056** **2057** **2058** **2059** **2060** **2061** **2062** **2063** **2064** **2065** **2066** **2067** **2068** **2069** **2070** **2071** **2072** **2073** **2074** **2075** **2076** **2077** **2078** **2079** **2080** **2081** **2082** **2083** **2084** **2085** **2086** **2087** **2088** **2089** **2090** **2091** **2092** **2093** **2094** **2095** **2096** **2097** **2098** **2099**

Arriving at such conclusions from the internal evidence of the *Odyssey*,<sup>1</sup> we can apply them by analogy to the *Iliad*. We know something respecting the character and capacities of that early age which he left no other monuments except these two poems. Long continuous epic (it is observed by those who support the views of Wolf, with an artificial structure, are inconsistent with the capacities of a rude and non-writing age. Such epics (we may reply) are not inconsistent with the early age of the Greeks, and the *Odyssey* is a proof of it; for is that poem the integration of the whole, and the composition of the parts, must have been simultaneous. The analogy of the *Odyssey* enables us to reject that preconception under which many ingenious critics set down to the study of the *Iliad*, and which induces them to explain all the lucubrations of the latter by breaking it up into smaller sections, as if short epics were the only manifestation of poetical power which the age admitted. There ought to be no reluctance in admitting a prevailing whimsical and premeditated unity of parts, in as far as the parts themselves point to such a conclusion.

That the *Iliad* is not so essentially one piece as the *Odyssey*, every man agrees. It includes a much greater multiplicity of events, and, what is yet more important, a greater multiplicity of prominent passages: the very indefinite title which it bears, as contrasted with the speciality of the name *Odyssey*, marks the difference at once. The particular evidence consequently from the whole, and admits more readily of being felt and appreciated in detached portions. We may also add, that it is of more unequal execution than the *Odyssey*—often rising to a far higher pitch of grandeur, but also occasionally sinking: the story does not move on continuously; incidents occur without plausible motive, nor can we detect any in evidence of mechanism and contrivance.

<sup>1</sup> Wolf, who, in great unpopulated passages, has supposed that actual portions of the *Odyssey*, supposed this previous internal evidence to make the general proposition, that no such unconnected and not necessarily linked fragments could be the work of the age of Homer. — The *Odyssey*, however, is a continuous whole, and consequently not composed of separate parts.

Although, however, Wolf's theory is not generally accepted, it is not without its merits. It is a theory which, if it is to be of any use, must be applied to the whole of the *Odyssey*, and not to a single part. It is a theory which, if it is to be of any use, must be applied to the whole of the *Odyssey*, and not to a single part. It is a theory which, if it is to be of any use, must be applied to the whole of the *Odyssey*, and not to a single part.

To a certain extent, the *Iliad* is open to all these remarks, though Wolf and Wilkins Miller, and above all Lockman, exaggerate the case in degree. And from hence has been deduced the hypothesis which treats the parts in their original state as separate integers, independent of and unconnected with each other, and forced into unity only by the afterthoughts of a subsequent age; or sometimes not even themselves as integers, but as aggregates grouped together out of fragments still smaller—short epics formed by the coalescence of still shorter songs. Now there is some plausibility in these reasonings, so long as the discrepancies are looked upon as the whole of the case. But on point of fact they are not the whole of the case: for it is not less true, that there are large portions of the *Iliad* which present features and substantial evidence of coherence as extensive and consequent, though we are occasionally perplexed by inconsistencies of detail. To deal with these latter is a portion of the duties of a critic. But he is not to treat the *Iliad* as if inconsistency prevailed everywhere throughout its parts; for coherence of parts—symmetrical antecedence and consequance is discernible throughout the larger half of the poem.

Now the Wilkins theory explains the gaps and contradictions throughout the narrative, but it explains nothing else. If (as Lockman states) the *Iliad* originally consisted of sixteen songs or little substantive epics (Lockman's sixteen songs cover the space only as far as the *Iliad* took to the death of Hector, and two more songs would have to be admitted for the 13th and 14th books)—not only composed by different authors, but by each <sup>1</sup> without any view to conjunction with the rest—we have then no right to suspect any intrinsic continuity between them; and all that consistency which we now find must be of extraneous origin. Where are we to look for the original? Lockman follows Wolf in attrib-

Lockman  
theory  
treats  
only  
as parts  
of the  
greater  
epic  
coherence  
is open  
parts.

Wilkins  
theory  
treats  
the songs,  
13th, and the  
14th.

<sup>1</sup> Lockman seems to admit one exception, which the composer of one song sometimes suggested to another song, and is "impossible to give, which will form a sequel to it. This dramatic song (the Polydamon) looks down on, and derives its end of the 13th book; the subsequent song including the two next books, from 14 to 16 inclusive."—

a confirmation of the theory, but by a different poet. (See note on Polydamon's speech, lines 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.)

This hypothesis of promiscuous subsequence is a curious system founded on the analogy of the Wilkins type *Iliad*.

ing the whole constructive process to Pelestratus and his associates, at a period when the creative apical faculty is admitted to have died out. But upon this supposition Pelestratus (or his associates) must have done much more than craft, transpire, and interpolate, here and there; he must have gone far to rewrite the whole poem. A great poet might have woven pre-existing separate songs into one comprehensive whole, but no mere arranger or compiler would be competent to do so; and we are thus left without any means of accounting for that degree of consistency and coherence which runs through so large a portion of the *Iliad*, though not through the whole. The effect that the poem as we read it grew out of staves not originally designed for the places which they now occupy, involves us in new and formidable difficulties when we seek to elucidate either the mode of coherences or the degree of creative unity.<sup>1</sup>

Admitting then premeditated adaptation of parts to a certain extent as essential to the *Iliad*, we may yet require whether it was produced all at once or gradually enlarged—whether by one author or by several; and if the parts be of different age, which is the primitive kernel, and which are the additions.

Wicks, Lange, and Witsch<sup>2</sup> treat the Homeric poems as representing a second step in advance in the progress of popular poetry. First comes the age of short narrative songs; next, when these have become numerous, there arise constructive whole

<sup>1</sup> The admission of the Welles theory appears to lead difficulties which have before their language is wanting in respect to those supposed primary revealed staves. Schmalzer's book must tell us that the original poems were much less perfect than the *Iliad* as we now read it. Is another then, that Schmalzer has not discovered what they originally were; and he further adds (as mentioned in the preceding note) that the part of the *Iliad* which may be supposed to be the original may be supposed to be the original.

<sup>2</sup> It is to be granted that the original constructive staves were so combined, though by different poets, so that the most recent were adapted to the earlier, with more or less strategy and design, the change to late being different conditions of the problem. It is a critical question of the Welles hypothesis, which however Schmalzer has shown to be wrong, and thus solved with ability, though the resolution of

it has, to my mind, a subtle effect of denying the historical evidence by denying it and yet something detailed and positive. I will add, in respect to the theory, that it is not a step in the development of the poem, — 1. That I find myself constantly observing from that critical position, on the strength of which, he will not speak as interpolations, and therefore begins at the end of the poem; 2. That the arguments against a continuity of the staves are often founded upon those which the critical arguments and the theory itself has already put forward to be interpolated; 3. That much of the argument as we have heard have been anticipated, and the theory does not in a complete and satisfactory way.

<sup>3</sup> Lange, in his *Ueber die Homerische Dichtung*, and Witsch, in his *Die Homerische Dichtung*, p. 11. (Quoted by Schmalzer, *Ueber die Homerische Dichtung*, p. 11.)





from the beginning of the *cleruch* back to the middle of the eighteenth, without any sensible halt in the march throughout so large a portion of the journey. Lockman likewise admits that these separate songs, *rotes*, which he imagines that the whole *lied* may be divided, cannot be viewed with the same disposure, as the books subsequent to the *cleruch*, as in these books (2). There is only one real halting-place from the *cleruch* back to the twenty-second—the death of Patroclus; and this can never be conceived as the end of a separate poem,<sup>1</sup> though it is a capital step in the development of the *Achilles*, and brings about that entire revolution in the temper of Achilles which was essential for the purpose of the poem. It would be a mistake to imagine that there could ever have existed a separate poem called *Patroclus*, though a part of the *lied* was designated by that name. For Patroclus has an subordinate position; he is the attendant, friend and second of Achilles, not nothing else,—standing to the latter in a relation of dependence resembling that of Telemachus to Odysseus. And the way in which Patroclus is dealt with in the *lied* is (in my judgment) the most disastrous and artless contrivance in the poem—that which approaches nearest to the next theme of the *Odyssey*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lockman, *German Romanism*, p. 109. Dr. Dietrich, *Altgermanische Studien*, vol. iii. p. 1.

After having pointed out certain dissimilarity which he notices in the *lied*, Schlegel, concerning books, he says, "Nur dasjenige, was nicht so leicht, als es scheint, die ganze *Odyssee* auszuhalten, ist die *Odyssee* in der *Odyssee*." "Nur dasjenige, was nicht so leicht, als es scheint, die ganze *Odyssee* auszuhalten, ist die *Odyssee* in der *Odyssee*." "Nur dasjenige, was nicht so leicht, als es scheint, die ganze *Odyssee* auszuhalten, ist die *Odyssee* in der *Odyssee*."

Lockman, *German Romanism*, p. 109. Dr. Dietrich, *Altgermanische Studien*, vol. iii. p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See also my introduction to the *Odyssey*.

There is no such point and there is no such point as the death of Patroclus. The *lied* is here interrupted with the death of Patroclus, in the present state of the poem, which is not the case with the *Odyssey*. See the review of P. Lockman's work, in the *Zeitung*, No. 10, 1818, in the *Zeitung*, No. 10, 1818, in the *Zeitung*, No. 10, 1818.

The passage in the *Odyssey* between the death of Achilles and the death of Patroclus, which is not the case with the *Odyssey*, is not the case with the *Odyssey*. The passage in the *Odyssey* between the death of Achilles and the death of Patroclus, which is not the case with the *Odyssey*, is not the case with the *Odyssey*. The passage in the *Odyssey* between the death of Achilles and the death of Patroclus, which is not the case with the *Odyssey*, is not the case with the *Odyssey*.



The great and capital weakness which prevents the strength of the Greeks and renders them incapable of defending themselves without Achilles, is the dismemberment by wounds of Agamemnon,

Wounds—  
wound of  
Agamem-  
non's thigh—  
wound and  
dismember-  
ing, all in the  
last of the  
seventh  
book.

Diomedes, and Odysseus: so that the defence of the wall and of the ships is left only to heroes of the second magnitude (Ajax alone excepted), such as Egeonon, Leonteus, Polyneus, Narcius, Menelaus, &c. Now it is remarkable that all these three first-rate chiefs are in full form at the beginning of the seventh book: all three are wounded in the battle which that book describes, and at the commencement of which Agamemnon is full of spirit and courage.

Nothing can be more striking than the manner in which Homer concentrates our attention in the first book upon Achilles as the hero, his quarrel with Agamemnon, and the salutation to the Greeks which we hold out as short to escape from it, through the intervention of Thetis with Zeus. But the incidents dwell upon from the beginning of the second book down to the combat between Hector and Ajax in the seventh, animated and interesting as they are, do nothing to reduce this promise. They are a splendid picture of the Trojan war generally, and extremely suitable to that larger title under which the poem has been immortalised—but the consequences of the anger of Achilles do not appear until the eighth book. The tenth book, or Delonida, is also a portion of the Iliad, but not of the Achilleid; while the ninth book appears to me a subsequent addition, never harmonising with that main stream

of giving help, when he meets Euryalus standing out of the hole, looking with a brave, yet sad, and inspiring the rescue. He supports the wounded warrior to the tent, and ministers to his suffering; but before this operation is fully completed, the Greek's hand has been fatally struck, and the Trojan are on the point of entering the city. Therefore this incident is added to provide the necessary point which brings over them all, and suggests in striking its pervasiveness to take the field at the head of the Myrmidons. The way in

which Patroclus is first pressed to the rescue, as a pretext to his brilliant but short-lived glory when he comes forth in arms, this incident fulfils his characteristic promise and the destiny of Achilles—and the highest truth in Homer's wisdom is made the vehicle of revelation in the path of his glorified Iliad, and leads to the immortal story of all those who follow a career of great risk, in the nature of the patriotic Achilles, to whose coming is once again by the ninth book of the Iliad.











Although he is contented to have put a lying spirit into the mouth of Achaean prophets—the real artifice here is, that Odysseus and his followers profess no effect. For in the first place Agamemnon takes a step very different from that which his former recommendations—and in the next place, when the Greek army is at length armed and goes forth to battle, it does not experience defeat (which would be the case if the intervention of Odysseus really proved successful), but survives on a successful day's battle, chiefly through the heroism of Diomedes. Instead of arming the Greeks with words, Agamemnon receives first a council of chiefs, and next an appeal of the host. And though himself in a temper of mind highly alien with the doubtful success of Odysseus, he deliberately assumes the language of despair in addressing the troops, having previously prepared Nestor and Odysseus for his doing so—mainly in order to try the courage of the men, and with formal instructions given to these two other chiefs that they are to speak in opposition to him. Now the intervention of Nestor and Odysseus, extremely satisfactory when coupled with the incidents which now follow it and making Nestor appear, but only appear, to make his presence of honoring Achilles as well as of leaving the Greeks,—forms exactly the point of junction between the *Adelphoi* and the *Iliad*.<sup>1</sup>

The book which Agamemnon plays off upon the temper of his army, though in itself skilful, serves a sufficient purpose, not only because it provides a special matter of interest to be submitted to the Greeks, but also because it calls forth the splendid description, so teeming with veracious detail, of the soldiers looking up of the assembly after Agamemnon's language, and of the desultory interferences of Odysseus to bring the men back, as well as to put down Thersites. This picture of the Greeks in arms, bringing out the two chief speaking and connecting heroes, was so important a part of the general Trojan war, that the poet has permitted himself to introduce it by assuming an impossible folly on the part of Agamemnon; just as he has referred to another far worse in the third book—the *Phrygiophony*

<sup>1</sup> The intervention of Odysseus would appear to imply an *agôn* (contest) preliminary to some real place in book II. The first language there of book II.

would fit in well with gradually at the beginning of book VII. The words of Nestor here form a proper sequel to the words of Diomedes.



















and in the earliest times the composer and the singer were one and the same person.<sup>6</sup> Now the individuals comprised in the Homeric Chorus, though doubtless very different among themselves in respect of mental capacity, were yet homogeneous in respect of training, means of observation and instruction, world experience, religious feelings and theories, &c., to a degree much greater than individuals in modern times. Fidelity is our inference as to this point, where we have only internal evidence to guide us, without any contemporary points of comparison, or any species of collateral information respecting the age, the society, the poets, the leaders, or the language—we must nevertheless in the present case take advantage of structure, together with consistency in the tone of thought, feeling, language, customs, &c., as presumptions of one author; and the contrary as presumptions of several; allowing as well as we can for that inequality of excellence which the same author may at different times warrant.

Now the new mode was against single-headed authorship of the Colquhoun appears to me very weak; and those who dispute it are guided more by their a priori rejection of external appeal, than by any positive evidence which the poem itself affords. It is otherwise with regard to the *Thiad*. Whatever presumptions a disjunct structure, several apparent inconsistencies of parts, and large extension of actual matter beyond the opening process, can suggest—one reasonably be indulged against the supposition that this poem all proceeds from a single author. There is a difference of opinion on the subject among the best critics which is probably not destined to be adjusted, since so much depends partly upon critical feeling, partly upon the general reasoning, in regard to ancient epic unity, with which a man owes to the study. For the characters of *reine*, such as Mr. Parns Knight, are very ready

<sup>2</sup> The concept of health, upon the possibility of such comparisons of people having different diseases, has been debated, and the issue remains, see Partridge (1997).

1. <i>Alga</i>	algae	algae	algae
2. <i>Alga</i>	algae	algae	algae
3. <i>Alga</i>	algae	algae	algae
4. <i>Alga</i>	algae	algae	algae
5. <i>Alga</i>	algae	algae	algae
6. <i>Alga</i>	algae	algae	algae
7. <i>Alga</i>	algae	algae	algae
8. <i>Alga</i>	algae	algae	algae
9. <i>Alga</i>	algae	algae	algae
10. <i>Alga</i>	algae	algae	algae

[illegible]

TABLE 1. *Continued*





of a preconceived scheme, but to imagine that the books from the night-school to the twenty-second, though forming part of that scheme or Achilleis, had yet been executed by another and an inferior poet. But it is to be remarked, first, that inferiority of position must to a certain extent be quite reconcilable with unity of authorship; and secondly, that the very circumstances upon which Wolf's unfavorable judgment is built, seem to arise out of increased difficulty in the poet's task, when he came to the arduous career of his despised Achilleis. For that which chiefly distinguishes these books is, the direct, incessant, and manual intervention of the gods and goddesses, formally permitted by Zeus—and the repetition of vast and fantastic conceptions to which such superhuman agency gave occasion; not marking the battle of Achilles against Alexander and Priam, and the burning up of these cities by Hephæstus. Now looking at this vein of ideas with the eyes of a modern reader, or even with those of a Greek critic of the literary age, it is certain that the effect is repulsive: the gods, sublime elements of poetry when kept in due proportion, are here somewhat vulgarised. But though the poet here has not succeeded—and probably never was incapable, in the task which he has prescribed to himself—yet the mere fact of his undertaking it, and the manifest distinction between his employment of divine agency in these latter cantos as compared with the preceding, seems explicable only on the supposition that they are the latter cantos and come in, despised epilogue, as the continuance of a previous plan. The poet wishes to surround the coming forth of Achilles with the maximum of glorious and terrific circumstances: no Trojan agency can for a moment hold out against him: the gods must descend to the plain of Troy

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad*, vii. 46. Zeus addresses the agents of the gods.—

*Ἐπεὶ δὲ θεῶν ἔδωκεν, ἄγε νῦν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων.*

*Ἐν οὖν Ἀχιλλεύῳ δὲ καὶ Ἰφιδάμῳ.*

*Ὀδὸν γὰρ ἔδωκεν, ἄγε νῦν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων.*

*Ἐν οὖν Ἀχιλλεύῳ δὲ καὶ Ἰφιδάμῳ.*

*Ὀδὸν γὰρ ἔδωκεν, ἄγε νῦν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων.*

The formal restriction put upon the

gods by Zeus at the beginning of the eighth book, and the reference of that restriction to the beginning of the Iliad, are probably parts of the preconceived scheme.

It is difficult to determine whether the battle of the gods and goddesses is itself not (as Wolf) to be interpreted as an epilogue, or only to be followed as it follows. *Iliad*, vii. 46. Zeus, ἄγε νῦν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων. *Iliad*, vii. 46. Zeus, ἄγε νῦν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων. *Iliad*, vii. 46. Zeus, ἄγε νῦν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων. *Iliad*, vii. 46. Zeus, ἄγε νῦν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων. *Iliad*, vii. 46. Zeus, ἄγε νῦν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων.



leave off with satisfaction at the moment in which Achilles enters his revenge, and while the bodies of Patroclus and Hector are lying unburied—also, that the more marvellous temper which he exhibits in the twenty-fourth book must always have been an indispensable requisite, in order to create proper sympathy with his triumph. Other critics, on the contrary, have taken special grounds of exception against the last book, and have endeavored to set it aside as different from the other books both in tone and language. To a certain extent the peculiarities of the last book appear to me reasonable, though it is plainly a designed coarseness and not a spontaneous poem. Some weight also is due to the remark about the twenty-third book, that Odysseus and Demobius, who have been wounded and disabled during the fight, now re-appear in perfect force, and contend in the games: here is no case of miraculous healing, and the incongruity is more likely to have been admitted by a separate enlarging poet than by the composer of the Iliad.

The splendid books begin the second to v. 321 of the seventh,<sup>1</sup> are equal in most parts to any portions of the Iliad, <sup>Book</sup> and are potently distinguished from the latter by <sup>it is etc.</sup> the broad view which they exhibit of the general <sup>features</sup>.

Trojan war, with all its principal personages, localities, and scenes—yet without advancing the result promised in the first book, or indeed any final purpose whatever. Even the desperate wound inflicted by Throchulus on Sarpedon is forgotten, when the latter hero is called forth in the subsequent Iliads.<sup>2</sup> The arguments of Lachmann, who divides these six books into three or four separate songs,<sup>3</sup> carry no conviction to my mind; and I see no reason why we should not consider all of them to be by

either person?" *Germania* vol. VII. p. 101, and 102—103. (New London, 1846.)

1. A strong suspicion respecting the authenticity of the Iliad, and its division into approximately thirty-three all distinct combinations of parts, is a great deal of ground to require the offering of every of every belonging to the Iliad which the Iliad is to be divided.

2. The Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad, the Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad, the Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad.

3. The Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad, the Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad, the Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad.

4. The Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad, the Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad, the Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad.

5. The Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad, the Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad, the Iliad is a poem of the seventh book is quoted in the very Iliad.



may himself have composed the letter: and such would be my belief, if I regarded plurality of composers as an inadmissible idea. On the supposition we must conclude that the poet, while anxious for the admission of war and for the most part highly interesting matter, has not thought fit to recast the parts and create in such manner as to impart to the whole a prevailing *Grand* of argument and organization, such as we see in the *Odyssey*.

That the *Odyssey* is of later date than the *Iliad*, and by a different author, seems to be now the opinion of most critics, especially of Payne Knight<sup>1</sup> and Vossius; though G. Hermann leans to a contrary conclusion, at the same time adding that he thinks the arguments either way not very decisive. There are considerable differences of statement in the two poems as regards to some of the gods: Iris is messenger of the gods in the *Iliad*, and Heracles in the *Odyssey*; *Odysseus*, the dispenser of the winds in the *Odyssey*, is not noticed in the twenty-third book of the *Iliad*, but on the contrary, Iris revives the winds as independent gods to come and trouble the funeral pile of Patroclus; and when we are to expunge the song of Demodocus in the eighth book of the *Odyssey* as spurious, Aphrodite there appears in the wish of Polydamas—a relationship not known to the *Iliad*. There are also some other points of difference enumerated by Mr. Knight and others, which tend to justify the presumption, that the author of the *Odyssey* is not identical either with the author of the *Achilleis* or his successor, which G. Hermann considers to be a point unquestionable.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, the difficulty of supposing a long subsequent poem to have been received, composed, and retained, without any aid of writing, appears to many critics even now insurmountable, though the evidence on the other side are in my view sufficient to outweigh any negative presumption thus suggested. But it is improbable that the same person should have power of memorial combination sufficient for composing two such poems, nor is there any need to have done so such a succession.

Presenting a difference of authorship between the two papers.

<sup>1</sup> My Englishman has told about  
his father, and his father was  
British, mother was French; a century

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26



if it were so, we could only infer that the author of the *Olympus* had found the *Achilles* or the *Iliad*; we could not infer that he lived *earlier* or *two generations afterwards*!

On the whole, the balance of probability seems in favour of distinct authorship of the two poems, but the same argument that sets a very early date, anterior to the first *Olympian*. And they may thus be used as evidence, and contemporary evidence, for the phenomena of primitive Greek civilization; while they also show that the power of constructing long promethized epics, without the aid of writing, as to be taken as a characteristic of the earliest known Greek mind. This was the point contended for by Wolf, which a full review of the case (in my judgment) decides against him; it is moreover a valuable resort for the historian of the Greeks, inasmuch as it marks out to him the ground from which he is to start in approaching their ancient progress.

The arguments upon the title of which *Prolegomena* and other titles have been mentioned, the *Prolegomena* to the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*, are equally strong and founded on evidence. The *Prolegomena* to the *Odyssey* (Book I. of *Prolegomena*) is the oldest of the two, and is the very beginning of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

The *Odyssey* of each argument is to be very interesting, though the *Prolegomena* upon the *Odyssey* is the oldest of the two, and is the very beginning of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

It is also the oldest of the two, and is the very beginning of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

It is also the oldest of the two, and is the very beginning of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

It is also the oldest of the two, and is the very beginning of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

It is also the oldest of the two, and is the very beginning of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

It is also the oldest of the two, and is the very beginning of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

It is also the oldest of the two, and is the very beginning of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.











# HISTORY OF GREECE.

---

## PART II. HISTORICAL GREECE.

## PART II.

### HISTORICAL GREECE.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### GENERAL GEOGRAPHY AND LIMITS OF GREECE.

Greece Proper lies between the 36th and 40th parallels of north latitude, and between the 19th and 26th degrees of *longitude* east longitude. Its greatest length from Mount *Ossa*

*Olympus* to Cape *Tenaros* may be stated at 350 English miles; its greatest breadth, from the western coast of *Albania* to *Macedonia* at *Athens*, at 180 miles, and the distance eastward from *Ambrakia* across *Pelion* to the *Magnesian* mountains *Herakle* and the mouth of the *Peneios* is about 150 miles. *Albania* the area is somewhat less than that of *Portugal*.<sup>1</sup> In regard however to all attempts at determining the exact limits of Greece Proper, we may remark, first, that these limits were not to have been very precisely defined even among the Greeks themselves; and next, that so large a proportion of the Hellenes was distributed among islands and colonies, and so much of their influence upon the world is general, pervading through their colonies, as to render the extent of their original domicile a matter of comparatively little moment to verify.

The chain called *Olympus* and the *Ossa* mountains, ranging east and west and continuing with the *Alps* the Sea or

<sup>1</sup> *Compendium Geograph. Statisticum of the Kingdom of Greece*, p. 4; and *Revue de Géographie*, vol. I. ch. v. p. 128.



**Alps.** From the northern base of Olympus, Pindus strikes off nearly southward, forming the boundary between Thessaly and Epirus, and ending forth about the 39th degree of latitude the lateral chain of Othrys—which latter takes an easterly course, reaching the sea between Thessaly and the northern coast of Euboea. Southward of Othrys, the chain of Pindus under the name of Tymphrestus still continues, and another lateral chain, called Ossa, projects from it again towards the east,—forming the lofty coast immediately south of the Malian Gulf, with the narrow road of Thermopylæ between the two—and terminating at the Eubœan strait. At the point of junction with Ossa, the chain of Pindus forks into two branches; one striking to the westward of south, and reaching across *Strida*, under the names of *Antikythera*, *Kariss*, *Korax* and *Tephineros*, to the promontory called *Antikythera*, situated on the northern side of the narrow entrance of the Corinthian Gulf, over against the corresponding promontory of Elion in Peloponnesus—the other trending south-east, and forming *Parnassos*, *Helicon*, and *Kithairon*: indeed *Agion* and *Hymettos*, even down to the southernmost cape of Attica, *Sunium*, may be treated as a continuation of this chain. From the eastern extremity of Ossa, also, a range of hills, inferior in height to the preceding, takes its departure in a south-easterly direction, under the various names of *Kotakia*, *Pelon*, and *Tymnæon*. It is joined with *Kithairon* by the lateral communication, ranging from west to east, called *Paros*; while the celebrated *Parosikina*, abundant in marble quarries, constitutes its connecting link, to the south of *Paros*, with the chain from *Kithairon* to *Sunium*.

From the promontory of *Antikythera* the line of mountains crosses into Peloponnesus, and stretches in a southerly direction down to the extremity of the peninsula called *Tenarus*, now Cape *Matapan*. Forming the boundary between Elis with *Messenia* on one side, and *Arkadia* with *Lacedæmon* on the other, it bears the excessive names of *Glaucus*, *Panachalkina*, *Pholoi*, *Erymanthos*, *Lepæon*, *Pellion* and *Tygeron*. Another series of mountains rises off from *Kithairon* towards the south-west, constituting under the names of *Gortaina* and *Oreia* the high ground which first sinks down into the depression forming the Isthmus of

—chain con-  
tinued and  
discontin-  
ued  
through  
Sparta  
Greece and  
Pelopon-  
nesus.











east, the lake Kopas is bounded by the high land of Mount Pelion, which intercepts its communication with the Straits of Ruben. Through the lacunae of this mountain the water has either found or forced several subterranean outlets, by which it obtains a partial access on the other side of the rocky hill and then flows into the sea. The Karsthölen, as they were termed in antiquity, yet exist, but in an imperfect and half-obstructed condition. Even in antiquity however they never fully sufficed to carry off the surplus waters of the Kopas; for the remains are still found of an artificial tunnel, passed through the whole breadth of the rock, and with perpendicular openings at proper intervals to let in the air from above. This tunnel—one of the most interesting remains of antiquity, since it must date from the prosperous days of the old Cydonians, anterior to its absorption into the Boeotian legend, as well as to the preponderance of Pelion—is now choked up and rendered useless. It may perhaps have been designedly obstructed by the hand of an enemy. The scheme of Alexander the Great, who considered an engineer from Chalkis to re-open it, was defeated first by dissidents in Boeotia, and ultimately by his early death.<sup>1</sup>

The Karsthölen of the lake Kopas are a specimen of the phenomenon as frequent in Greece—lakes and rivers finding for themselves subterranean passages through the service to the lacunose rocks, and even pursuing their natural course for a considerable distance before they emerge to the light of day. In Greece, especially, several remarkable examples of subterranean water-communication occur: the central region of Peloponnesus presents a cluster of such completely isolated valleys or basins.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, *loc. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> Colonel Leake observes (Travels in Greece, vol. iii, pp. 44, 107—108), "The plain of Peloponnesus, bounded west at Triana and westward to St. George's, is the greatest of that cluster of valleys in the centre of Peloponnesus, each of which is so closely shut in by the surrounding mountains, that no outlet is afforded to the subterranean drainage through the service of nature, &c." Describing the different subterranean and the mountain lake water phenomena, see the same work, p. 107, and the mountain plain near Corinth, p. 108.

<sup>3</sup> Subterranean passages of the same sort similar to the ancient subterranean communication between the lakes of the Peloponnesus (A. Strabo, *loc. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 107, and p. 108, &c.).

Travelling handily with this phenomenon was in part the source of some geographical suppositions, which are applied to an alluvial tract, regarding the long subterranean and perpendicular descent of certain rivers, and their re-emergence at very distant points. Strabo says that the fountain of Alpheus joined the fountain of











Achæads; and distant from each other by the space which separates Troezen from Marathon. All these various clans were comprised in the name Hællæ, which implied no geographical unity: all prided themselves on Hællæic blood, name, religion and mythical ancestry. As the only communication between them was maritime, so the sea, important even if we look to Greece Proper exclusively, was the sole channel for transmitting ideas and improvements, as well as for maintaining sympathies, social, political, religious, and literary, throughout those outlying members of the Hællæic aggregate.

The ancient philosophers and legislators were deeply impressed with the contrast between an island and a maritime city: in the former, simplicity and uniformity of life, tenacity of ancient habits and dislikes of what is new or foreign, great force of exclusive sympathy and narrow range both of objects and ideas; in the latter, variety and novelty of sensations, expansive imagination, toleration, and occasional propensities for extraneous reforms, greater activity of the individual and corresponding instability of the state. This distinction stands prominent in the many comparisons instituted between the Athens of Pericles and the Athens of the earlier times down to Solon. Both Plato and Aristotle dwell upon it emphatically—and the former especially, whose genius conceived the comprehensive scheme of prescribing behaviour and enacting in practice the whole course of individual thought and feeling in his imaginary community, treats maritime civilization, if pushed beyond the narrowest limits, as fatal to the success and permanence of any wise scheme of education. Certain it is that a great difference of character existed between those Greeks who mingled much in maritime affairs, and those who did not. The Aristæus may stand as a type of the pure Grecian landman, with his rustic and idiosyncratic habits<sup>1</sup>—his diet of sweet chestnuts, barley cakes and pork (as contrasted with the Sol-

Views of the ancient philosophers on the influence of maritime habits and commerce.

Differences between the land states and the maritime in Greece.

<sup>1</sup> Aristæus, *op. cit.* Aristot. *Politic.* II. 2-3. The sea, says Plato in *Republic* is just and wise education (which he also terms *deipnæ* and *gymnastikê*) through which the person is duly cultivated.

<sup>2</sup> Aristæus, *op. cit.* *Republic* II. 2. *deipnæ* and *gymnastikê* are the same as *gymnastics* and *gymnastics* in English. *deipnæ* is the same as *deipnæ* in English. *gymnastikê* is the same as *gymnastikê* in English.

which formed the chief reasoning for the breed of an Athenian)—his superior courage and endurance—his reverence for Lacedæmonian hardihood as an old and customary influence—his sterility of intellect and imagination as well as his slowness in enterprise—his unchangeable relations of relations with the gods, which led him to scourge and punish Pan if he came back empty-handed from the chase; while the intemperance of Phidias or Miltias exemplifies the Grecian manner, eager in search of gain—active, skilful, and daring at sea, but reticent in steadfast loyalty on land—more variable in imagination as well as more variable in character—full of pomp and expense in religious manifestations towards the Ephesian Artemis or the Apollo of Branchidæ: with a mind more open to the varieties of Grecian energy and to the refining influence of Grecian civilisation. The Peloponnesians generally, and the Lacedæmonians in particular, approached to the Arcadian type—while the Athenians of the fifth century B.C. stood foremost in the other; superseding to it however a delicacy of taste, and a preponderance of intellectual sympathy and enjoyments, which seem to have been peculiar to themselves.

The configuration of the Grecian territory, so like in many respects to that of Switzerland, produced two effects of great moment upon the character and history of the people. In the first place, it materially strengthened their powers of defence: it shut up the country against those invasions from the interior which successively subjugated all their continental colonies; and it at the same time rendered each fraction more difficult to be attacked by the rest, so as to exercise a certain conservative influence in securing the tenure of several possessions: for the pass of Thermopylæ between Thessaly and Phœtia, that of Kithira between Boeotia and Attica, or the mountainous range of Ossa and Geraneia along the Isthmus of Corinth, were positions which an inferior number of brave men could hold against a much greater force of

<sup>a</sup> Adapted from G. L. Hunter, *Mathematical Models in Biology*, Wiley, New York, 1975.

Year	1990	1995	2000
1990	1990	1995	2000

**THEORY** *presented by* **Dr. John A. Schmalzer**

The alteration of *Ula*, which is already out of phase, in the intervals on the average, in time, appears remarkable.

**Fig. 1.** *Salmon* movement, north pole, south pole, and equator.

autocrats. But, in the next place, while it tended to protect each section of Greeks from being conquered, it also kept them politically disunited and perpetuated their separate autonomy. It fostered that powerful principle of repulsion, which depend even the smallest township to constitute itself a political unit apart from the rest, and to resist all idea of coalescence with others, either voluntary or compulsory. To a modern nation, accustomed to large political aggregations, and aspiring for good government through the representative system, it requires a conscious mental effort to transport himself back to a time when even the smallest town clung so tenaciously to its right of self-legislation. Nevertheless such was the general habit and feeling of the ancient world, throughout Italy, Sicily, Spain, and Gaul. Among the Hellenes it stands out more conspicuously, for several reasons—first, because they seem to have pushed the multiplication of autonomous units to an extreme point, seeing that even islands not larger than Popondia and Samos had two or three separate city communities;<sup>1</sup> secondly, because they produced, for the first time in the history of mankind, such systematic thinkers on matters of government, amongst all of whom the idea of the autonomous city was accepted as the indispensable basis of political speculation; thirdly, because this incessant subdivision proved finally the cause of their ruin, in spite of pronounced intellectual superiority over their conquerors; and lastly, because incapacity of political coalescence did not preclude a powerful and extensive sympathy between the inhabitants of all the separate cities, with a constant tendency to interfere for numerous purposes, social, religious, recreative, intellectual, and aesthetic. For these reasons, the indefinite multiplication of self-governing towns, though in truth a phenomenon common to ancient Europe as contrasted with the large monarchies of Asia, appears more marked among the ancient Greeks than elsewhere: and there cannot be any doubt that they were it, to a considerable degree, in the multitude of warring boundaries which the configuration of their country presented.

Nor is it rash to suppose that the same causes may have tended to prevent that borrowed intellectual development for which they stand so conspicuous. General propositions respecting

<sup>1</sup> *Strabo*, *Periplus*, 24.

the working of climate and physical agencies upon character are indeed touchstone; for our knowledge of the globe is now sufficient to teach us that heat and cold, moisture and place, sea and land, moist and dry atmospheres, are all consistent with the greatest diversities of resident man: moreover the contrast between the population of Greece itself, for the seven centuries preceding the Christian era, and the Greeks of more modern times, is alone enough to moderate reserve in such speculations. Nevertheless we may venture to note certain improving influences, connected with their geographical position, at a time when they had no books to study, and no more advanced professions to imitate. (We may remark, first, that their position made them at once mountaineers and mariners, thus supplying them with great variety of objects, sensations, and adventures; next, that such petty community, nestled apart under its own rocks,<sup>1</sup> was sufficiently severed from the rest to possess an individual life and character of its own, yet not so far as to subvert it from the sympathy of the remainder; so that an obscure Greek, commencing with a great diversity of half-countrymen, whose language he understood, and whose idiosyncrasies he could appreciate, had access to a larger mass of social and political experience than any other man in so untrammelled an age could personally obtain. The Phœnicians, superior to the Greek on ship-board, traversed wider distances and saw a greater number of strangers, but had not the same means of intimate communion with a multiplicity of fellows in blood and language. His relations, confined to purchase and sale, did not engender that variety of action and reaction which pervaded the crowd at a Grecian festival. The scene which here presented itself was a mixture of uniformity and variety highly stimulating to the observant faculties of a man of genius,—who at the same time, if he sought to communicate his own impressions, or to act upon this mingled and diverse audience, was forced to shake off what was peculiar to his own town or community, and to put forth matter in harmony with the feelings of all. (It is thus that we may explain in part that penetrating appreciation of human life and character, and that power of touching sympathies

<sup>1</sup> *Thucyd. de Imper. l. 24.* "Θάλασσαν δὲ καὶ ἀγροὺς ἐκείνην οὐκ ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' ἅπαντες."

common to all ages and nations, which surprises us so much in the unlettered authors of the old epic. Such periodical inter-communication, of brethren habitually isolated from each other, was the only means then open of procuring for the hard & diversified rings of experience and a many-coloured existence; and it was to a great degree the result of geographical causes. Perhaps among other nations such facilitating means might have been found, yet without producing any result comparable to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. But Homer was nevertheless dependent upon the conditions of his age, and we can at least point out three particulars in early Greek society without which Homeric epics would never have existed,—the geographical position in one, the language another.

In mineral and metallic wealth Greece was not distinguished. Gold was obtained in considerable abundance in the island of Siphnos, which, throughout the sixth century Mineral  
products  
known. B.C., was among the richest communities of Greece, and possessed a treasure-chamber at Delphi distinguished for the richness of its votive offerings. At that time gold was so rare in Greece, that the Lacedæmonians were obliged to send to the Lydian Greeks in order to provide enough of it for the gilding of a statue.<sup>1</sup> It appears to have been more abundant in Asia Minor, and the quantity of it in Greece was much multiplied by the opening of mines in Thracia, Macedonia, Epirus, and even some parts of Thessaly. In the island of Timaea, too, some mines were re-opened with profitable result, which had been originally begun, and subsequently abandoned, by Phœnician settlers of an earlier century. From these mines districts also was procured a considerable amount of silver; while about the beginning of the fifth century B.C., the first effective commencement seems to have been made of turning to account the rich southern district of Attica, called Laurion. Copper was obtained in various parts of Greece, especially in Cyprus and Eubœa—in which latter island was also found the earth called *Chama*, employed for the purification of the ore. Bronze was used among the Greeks for

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, I. 94; II. 27, 28, 29—30. Strabo, *Travels*, *History of Attica*, &c.

<sup>2</sup> The gold and silver offerings sent to the Delphic temple, even from the

Roman times (I. 2, II. 276—277), were considered valuable, especially those dedicated by Greece, with Herodotus, I. 27—29, seems to have enjoyed its prerogative.

many purposes in which iron is now employed: and even the axes of the Hecæan barrow (different in this respect from the later historical Greeks) are composed of copper, tempered in such a way as to impart to it an astonishing hardness. Iron was found in Salona, Scania, and Melos—but still more abundantly in the mountainous regions of the Lacedæmon Tegyria. There is however no part of Greece where the remains of ancient metallurgy appear now so conspicuous, as the island of Seriphos. The excellence and varieties of marble, from Pentelina, Hymettus, Paros, Karyæna, &c., and other parts of the country—so essential for purposes of sculpture and architecture—are well known.<sup>1</sup>

Situated under the same parallels of latitude as the coast of Asia Minor, and the southernmost regions of Italy and Spain, Greece produced wheat, barley, fax, wine, and oil, in the earliest times of which we have any knowledge; though the corns, Indian corn, silk, and tobacco which the country now exhibits, are an addition of more recent times. Theophrastus and other authors amply attest the observant and industrious agriculture prevalent among the ancient Greeks, as well as the care with which its various natural productions, comprehending a great diversity of plants, herbs, and trees, were turned to account. The cultivation of the vine and the olive—the latter indispensable to ancient life not merely for the purposes which it serves at present, but also from the constant habit then prevalent of anointing the body—appears to have been particularly elaborate; and the many different accidents of soil, level, and exposure, which were to be found, not only in Helles Propus, but also among the scattered Greek settlements, afforded to observant planters materials for study and comparison. The barley cake seems to have been more generally eaten than the wheaten loaf;<sup>2</sup> but one or other of them, together with vegetables and fish (sometimes fresh, but more frequently salt), was the common food of the population; the

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, v. p. 447; also p. 486—494. Scania, *Strabo*, v. p. 447; *Strabo*, *Geographica*. Scania, *Strabo*, v. p. 447. *Strabo*, *Geographica*, vol. i. p. 447. *Strabo*, *Geographica*, vol. i. p. 447.

<sup>2</sup> After remarking that the practice of eating the barley cake was the practice of the Greeks, Strabo speaks of the barley cake as the ordinary food, whence

Strabo for the sake of the Greeks, in p. 447.

The milk of cows and goats was in ancient times produced in Greece, and in the island of Rhodes, in p. 447. It was also produced in the island of Rhodes, and in the island of Rhodes, in p. 447. It was also produced in the island of Rhodes, and in the island of Rhodes, in p. 447.

Ancients fed much upon pork, and the Spartans also consumed animal food, but by the Greeks generally both meat seems to have been little eaten, except at festivals and sacrifices. The Athenians, the most commercial people in Greece Proper, though their light, dry, and comparatively poor soil produced excellent barley, nevertheless did not grow enough corn for their own consumption: they imported considerable supplies of corn from Sicily, from the coasts of the Helles, and the Thracian Chersonese, and salt fish both from the Propontis and even from Odesa:<sup>1</sup> the distance from whence these supplies came, when we take into consideration the extent of fine corn-land in Sicily and Thessaly, proves how little internal trade existed between the various regions of Greece Proper. The exports of Athens consisted in her figs and other fruits, olives, oil—for all of which she was distinguished—together with pottery, ornamental manufactures, and the silver from her mines at Lavrion. Salt-fish, besides being its way more or less throughout all Greece;<sup>2</sup> but the population of other states in Greece lived more exclusively upon their own produce than the Athenians, with less of produce and sale<sup>3</sup>—a mode of life sustained by the simple domestic economy universally prevalent, in which the women not only carded and spun all the wool, but also were out of it the clothing and bedding employed in the family. Weaving was then considered as much a woman's business as spinning, and the same feeling and habits still prevail to the present day in modern Greece, where the loom is constantly seen in the peasant's cottages, and always worked by women.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Thucydides*, *Opus*, II. li. 2. *Strabo*, vi. c. 1. *Pliny*, ii. 1. That salt fish came from the Propontis and from the Thracian Chersonese is the opinion of Athens during the Peloponnesian war, appears from a fragment of the *Memoria* of Demosthenes, in *de* *Minister*, *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1.

<sup>3</sup> The Phœnicians, merchants who brought the salt fish from Odesa, both from the Propontis and from the Thracian Chersonese, were famous for this among the ancient Greeks of the coast of Mæotis (Black Sea), *Pliny*, ii. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Strabo*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1.

The Cretans, merchants who brought people who sold a variety of salt fish, or of olives, or the heads of salt fish, from the Propontis and from the Thracian Chersonese, were famous for this among the ancient Greeks of the coast of Mæotis (Black Sea), *Pliny*, ii. 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1. *Thucyd.*, *lib.*, 1.



The climate of Greece appears to be generally described by modern travellers in more favourable terms than it was by the ancients, which is easily explicable from the classical sources, picturesque localities, and transparent atmosphere, so vividly appreciated by an English, or a German eye. Herodotus,<sup>1</sup> Hippocrates, and Aristotle, treat the climate of Asia as far more genial and favourable both to animal and vegetable life, but at the same time more enervating than that of Greece: the latter they speak of chiefly in reference to its changeful character and diversity of local temperatures, which they consider as highly stimulant to the energies of the inhabitants. There is reason to conclude that ancient Greece was much more healthy than the same territory is at present, inasmuch as it was more industriously cultivated, and the rivers both more carefully maintained and better supplied with water. But the differences in respect of healthiness, between one portion of Greece and another, appear always to have been considerable, and this, as well as the diversity of climate, affected the local habits and character of the particular nations. Not nearly were there great differences between the mountaineers and the inhabitants of the plains<sup>2</sup>—between Locrians, Mithians, Phocians, Dorians, Cissians and Arcadians, on one hand, and the inhabitants of Attica, Boeotia, and Epeia, on the other—but each of the various tribes which went to compose these categories had its peculiarities; and the marked contrast between Athenians and Boeotians was supposed to be represented by the light and heavy atmosphere which they respectively breathed. Nor was this all: for even among the Boeotian aggraves, every town had its own separate traditions, played as well as moral and political:<sup>3</sup> Orizæ, Tanagra, Thebes, Thèbes,

near the coast (Strab. G. G. 10; Steph. G. G. 10).

<sup>1</sup> For the opinions and remarks of the ancients, see Strabo, *Geograph. Strab.* 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

<sup>2</sup> The mountaineers of Attica, as of other parts, appear to have been less

the mountaineers of Attica, as of other parts, appear to have been less healthy than the inhabitants of the plains (Strab. G. G. 10; Steph. G. G. 10).

<sup>3</sup> Strabo, *Geograph. Strab.* 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

Archæidæ, Kallistæ, Kerkiræ, Orestidæ, and Flakæ, were known to Hecataeus each by its own characteristic epithet, and Thucydides even notices a marked distinction between the inhabitants of the city of Athens and those in the country of Attika. Sparta, Argos, Corintha, and Sikyôn, though all called Doric, had each its own dialect and pronunciation. All these differences, depending in part upon climate, site, and other physical considerations, contributed to seventh migrations, and in perpetuate that important element, which has already been noticed as an inflexible feature in Hellen.

The Epirætes tribes, neighbours of the Ætolians and Akarnanians, filled the space between Pindos and the Ionian Sea until they joined to the northwest the territory inhabited by the powerful and barbarous Illyrians. Of these Illyrians the native Macedonian tribes appear to have been an outlying nation, dwelling northwest of Thessaly and Mount Olympus, northwest of the shores by which Pindos is contained, and westward of the river Atræa. The Epirætes were comprehended under the various designations of Chaonians, Molossians, Thesprotians, Keryraians, Amphilochians, Aikadianæ, the Molians, Tymphaei, Orestæ, Perræi, and Akantians—most of the latter being small communities dispersed about the mountainous region of Pindos. There was however much confusion in the application of the comprehensive name Epiræ, which was a title given altogether by the Greeks, and given partly upon geographical, and partly official considerations. Epiræ seems at first to have stood opposed to Peloponnesos, and to have signified the general region northwest of the Gulf of Corinth; and in this primitive sense it comprehended the Ætolians and Akarnanians, portions of whom speak a dialect different to the others, and were not less widely removed than the Epirætes from Hellenic habits.<sup>1</sup> The coast of Epirus forms the point of ancient union between Greeks and Epirætes, which was superseded by Delphi as the civilisation of Hellen developed.

*Epiræ,  
Molossæ,  
Keræiæ, &c.*

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, i. 148, speaking of the Dorians, says, they occupy the "country of the Akantians in Epirus."

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, i. 148, speaking of the Dorians, says, they occupy the "country of the Akantians in Epirus."

<sup>3</sup> Herodotus, i. 148, speaking of the Dorians, says, they occupy the "country of the Akantians in Epirus."

<sup>4</sup> Herodotus, i. 148, speaking of the Dorians, says, they occupy the "country of the Akantians in Epirus."

(note). May it be less difficult to distinguish Epirus from Macedonia on the one hand than from Hellas on the other; the language, the dress, and the fashion of wearing the hair being often analogous, while the boundaries, whether rude men and untrodden tracts, were very imperfectly understood?

In describing the lands occupied by the Hellenes in 776 a.c., we cannot yet take account of the important colonies of Ionia and Achaia, established by the Greeks subsequently on the western coast of Epirus. The Greeks of that early time seem to comprise the islands of Kephallonia, Zakynthos, Ithaka, Delphos, but no settlement, either inland or farther, farther northward.

They include farther, confining ourselves to 776 a.c., the great mass of islands between the coast of Greece and that of Asia Minor, from Thracian on the north, to Rhodes, Kos, and Kythira southward: and the great islands of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, and Lesbos, as well as the groups called the Sporades, and the Cyclades. Respecting the four considerable islands nearest to the coast of Macedonia and Thracian—Lemnos, Imbros, Rhodope, Samothrace, and Thracian—it may be doubted whether the Greeks they were at that time inhabited. The Catalogue of the Iliad includes under Agamemnon's contingent from Epirus, Lesbos, Kos, Karpaius, Kame, Khe, and Rhodes; in the oldest extant testimony which we possess, these islands thus appear inhabited by Greeks; but the others do not occur in the Catalogue, and are never mentioned in such manner as to enable us to draw any inference. Lesbos might perhaps rather be looked upon as a portion of Greece mainland (from which it was only separated by a stout narrow enough to be bridged over) than as an island. But the last five islands named in the Catalogue are all either wholly or partially Doric: no Ionia or Achaia island appears in it: none latter, though it was among them that the poet sang, appear to be represented by their ancestral heroes who come from Greece Proper.

The last element to be included, as going to make up the

<sup>1</sup> Ithaka, vii. p. 200.  
Several of the Sporades which were  
known, appear there in addition to  
those which follow.

See, as all the inhabitants of these

regions, the excellent description of  
C. Müller above quoted. Under the  
Hellenes, regarded in the first  
volume of the English translation of  
Hesiodus of the Cyclades.

Greece of 776 B.C., is the long string of Doric, Ionic and Achaean settlements on the coast of Asia Minor—occupying <sup>quadrant</sup> a space bounded on the north by the Troad and the <sup>the coast of</sup> region of Ida, and extending southward as far as the <sup>Asia Minor</sup> peninsula of Kallia. Twelve continental cities, ever and anon the islands of Lesbos and Tenedos, are possessed by Hellenes as ancient Achaean foundations—Smyrna, Kymē, Larissa, Naxos-Trochos, Ténos, Etila, Nefion, Siphnos, Páros, Rhos, Myrina, and Gyrene. Smyrna, having been at first Achaean, was afterwards acquired through a marriage by Ionia inhabitants, and remained permanently Ionic. Phokos, the northernmost of the Ionic settlements, looked upon Achaia; Klazomenae, Erythra, Teos, Lebedos, Kolophôn, Priênê, Myos, and Miletos, maintained the Ionic name to the northwest. These, together with Samos and Chios, formed the *Pæonians* *Ionian*.<sup>1</sup> To the north of Miletos, after a considerable interval, lay the Doric establishments of Myndos, Halikarnassos, and Knidos: the two latter, together with the island of Kos and the three townships in Rhodes, constituted the Doric *Heptapolis*, or communion of six cities, concerted primarily with a view to religious purposes, but producing a secondary effect analogous to political federation.

Such then is the extent of Hellas, as it stood at the commencement of the recorded Olympiads. To draw a picture even for this date, we possess no authentic materials, and are obliged to circulate statements which belong to a later age: and this consideration might alone suffice to show how untrustworthy are all delineations of the Greece of 776 B.C., the supposed epoch of the Trojan war, four centuries earlier.

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, i. 149-150.

## CHAPTER II.

THE HELLENIC PEOPLE GENERALLY, IN THE EARLY  
HISTORICAL TIMES.

THE territory indicated in the last chapter—south of Mount Olympus, and south of the line which connects the city of Amphipolis with Mount Pindus,—was occupied during the historical period by the central stock of the Hellenic or Greek, from which their numerous outlying colonies were planted out.

Both metropolitans and colonies styled themselves Hellenes, and were recognised as such by each other; all glorying in the name as the prominent symbol of fraternity,—all describing non-Hellenic men or cities by a word which involved connotations of repugnance. Our term *barbarian*, borrowed from this latter word, does not express the same idea; for the Greek spoke thus indistinctly of the extra-Hellenic world with all its inhabitants,<sup>1</sup> whatever might be the gentleness of their character, and whatever might be their degree of civilization. The rulers and people of Egyptian Thebes with their ancient and gigantic monuments, the wealthy Tyrians and Carthaginians, the phil-Hellenic Argives of Argos, the well-disciplined patriarchs of Rome (to the indignation of old Calio)<sup>2</sup> were all comprised in it. As first it seemed to have expressed more of repugnance than of contempt, and repugnance especially towards the sound of a

<sup>1</sup> See the protest of Herodotus against the assumption of the word, *ἑλλήνων* like *ἑκείνων* and *ἐκείνων*, after the latter word had come to imply violence (see *Herodotus*, ii. p. 48; *Mythology*, *Prolegomena*, p. 10).

<sup>2</sup> *Herodotus*, ii. lib. p. 48; see also *Herodotus*, ii. lib. p. 48; *Mythology*, *Prolegomena*, p. 10. A translation of Calio's letter to the king.

indicating the enemy, according to the Greeks; the translation of the word *ἑλλήνων* and *ἑκείνων* is a slight word of their language. . . . *Herodotus*, ii. lib. p. 48; *Mythology*, *Prolegomena*, p. 10. A translation of Calio's letter to the king.

foreign language'. Afterwards a feeling of their own superior intelligence (in part well justified) arose among the Greeks, and their term *barbaros* was used so as to imply a low state of the temper and intelligence: in which sense it was retained by the semi-civilized Romans, as the proper epithet to their state of civilization. The want of a suitable word, corresponding to *barbaros* as the Greeks originally used it, is a movement in the description of German phenomena and institutions, that I may be obliged occasionally to use the word in its primitive sense.

The Hellenes were all of common blood and parentage, were all descendants of the common patriarch Hellen. In treating of the historical Greeks, we have to accept this as a datum; it represents the continent under the influence of which they moved and acted. It is placed by Herodotus in the front rank, as the chief of those four ties which bound together the Hellenic aggregate: 1. Fellowship of kind; 2. Fellowship of language; 3. Fixed domesticity of gods, and countless, common to all; 4. Like manners and domesticity.

Then (say the Athenians in their reply to the Spartan envoys, in the very crisis of the Persian invasion) "Athens will never disgrace herself by betraying". And Zeno Hellenist was recognized as the god watching over and enforcing the integrity of the constitution.<sup>3</sup>

Technicians, Revolution, and Tiger-Helms,<sup>4</sup> all believed that these

[illegible]

1. *Scaly Skinned Antechinus*,  
Thomomys, Ill. & M. *Thomomys* does not  
use the Wood Rat as its only source  
of food. It also takes a variety of other  
foods, especially insects. (1. *Thomomys*  
does not take a variety of other  
foods, especially insects.)

and the world, philosophy often has appeared as a language of the state or of Great Britain.

1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 2680, 26

This 1977 film tells a story in three chapters: the early conquest of California by the Spaniards (1769-1800), the

<sup>1</sup> Journal, 1911, 141. At this point the formula is not homogeneous and the element is not a metal. Journal, 1911, 141.

[illegible][illegible]

It will be part of the presidential campaign, making the Congress, prior to the inauguration of the Executive, responsible, not only to keep away "anybody else under [Lincoln's] name," but also to the

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 261, 11, 1331, 1989.

had been an ante-Hellenic period, when different languages, mutually unintelligible, were spoken between Mount Olympus and Cape Malea. However this may be, during the historical times the Greek language was universal throughout these limits—branching out however into a great variety of dialects, which were roughly classified by later literary men into *Ionæ*, *Doricæ*, *Æolicæ*, and *Atticæ*. But the classification presents a *surprise*—a semblance of regularity, which in point of fact does not seem to have been realized; each town, each smaller subdivision of the Hellenic name, having particularities of dialect belonging to itself. Now the lettered men who framed the quadruple division took notice chiefly, if not exclusively, of the written dialects,—those which had been recorded by poets or other authors; the more spoken idioms were for the most part neglected.<sup>1</sup> That there was no such thing as one *Ionæ* dialect in the speech of the people called *Ionæ* Greeks, we know from the indisputable testimony of Herodotus,<sup>2</sup> who tells us that there were four capital varieties of speech among the twelve *Æolicæ* towns especially known as *Ionæ*. Of course the varieties would have been much more numerous if he had given us the importance of his list in *Æolonia*, the *Cyclades*, *Mæolis*, *Thraciam*, and *Orta*,—all numbered as *Grecia* and as *Ioniana*. The *Ionæ* dialect of the grammarians was in extract from Homer, *Hesiodus*, *Herodotus*, *Hippocrates*, &c.; to what living speech it made the nearest approach, amidst those divergences which the historian has made known to us, we cannot tell. *Sappho* and *Alcæus* in *Lesbos*, *Sappho* and *Korinna* in *Iosia*, were the great sources of reference for the *Lesbian* and *Iosian* varieties of the *Æolic* dialect—of which there was a third variety, unknown by the poets, in *Thasos*.<sup>3</sup> The analogy between the different manifestations of *Doric* and *Æolic*, as well as that between the *Doric* generally and the *Æolic* generally, contrasted with the *Attic*, is only to be taken as rough and approximative.

<sup>1</sup> "Antiqui grammatici non tantum dialectos spectabant, sed etiam varietatem et modum loquendi, quæ non exigenter sibi in orem parva, non intelliguntur." *Grammaticæ Græcæ*, p. 12. The same has been the case, in a greater degree, even in the linguistic classification of modern times, through pointing out

effects such increased facility for the recognition of popular dialects.

<sup>2</sup> *Herod.* i. 62.

<sup>3</sup> Regarding the three varieties of the *Æolic* dialect, differing essentially from each other, see the valuable work of *Alcæus*, in *Phil. Mus.*, vol. ii. B, 45.

But all these different dialects are nothing more than dialects, distinguished as modifications of one and the same language, and exhibiting evidence of certain laws and principles prevailing them all. They seem capable of being traced back to a certain blood-mother-language, peculiar in itself and distinguishable from, though cognate with, the Latin; a representative member of what has been called the Indo-European family of languages. This truth has been brought out in recent times by the comparative examination applied to the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, German, and Lithuanian languages, as well as by the more accurate analysis of the Greek language itself to which such studies have given rise, in a manner much more clear than could have been imagined by the ancients themselves.<sup>1</sup> It is needless to dwell upon the importance of this uniformity of language in holding together the race, and in rendering the poems of its most forward members available to the civilization of all. Except in the recent ages, the divergence of dialect was not such as to prevent every Greek from understanding, and being understood by, every other Greek,—not remarkable when we consider how many of their emigrating colonists, not having taken out women in their emigration, intermarried with non-Hellenic wives. And the perfection and popularity of their early epic poems were here of incalculable value for the diffusion of a common type of language, and for thus keeping together the sympathies of the Hellenic world.\* The Homeric dialect became the standard followed by all Greek poets for the *Hexameter*, as may be seen particularly from the example of Hesiod—who adheres to it in the main, though his father was a native of the *Æolia Egeia*, and he himself resident at Astus, in *Æolia Boeotia*—and the early Iambic and Elegiac compositions are framed on the same model. Intellectual Greeks in all cities, even the most distant estimate from the central hearth, became early accustomed to one type of literary speech, and possessed of a common stock of legends, maxims, and metaphors.

<sup>1</sup> The work of Albert Otto, *Ueber das H. Griech. Dialect* (probably not finished, or, at least, of the early death of the author), presents an important specimen of such inquiries.

<sup>2</sup> See the interesting remarks of the *Chrysostomus* on the standard of the

Intellectuals of Cities for the formation of the Homeric poems; none of them, he says, wrote along the lines of speech, though their dialect was partially cultivated, and the day is a not distant of when the Chrysostomus (Chrysostomus, p. 14, Bæd.)







prices. He counts the former as Pan-Hellenic work and custom, an ornament even to the city of which the latter was a member—the latter as partial and confined to the neighbourhood.

Of the beginnings of these great assemblies we cannot presume to speak, except in mythical language: we know them only in their comparative maturity. But the habit of common sacrifices, on a small scale and between near neighbours, is a part of the earliest habits of Greece. The sentiment of fraternity, between two tribes or villages, first manifested itself by sending a mixed legation or *Theoria*\* to offer sacrifices at each other's festivals and to partake in the ceremonies which followed; thus establishing a truce with solemn guarantees, and bringing themselves into direct communion each with the god of the other under his appropriate local names. The pacific communities so fostered, and the increased awareness of taboos, as Greece gradually emerged from the turbulence and paganism of the heroic age, operated especially in extending the range of the sacred habit; the village festivals became town festivals, largely frequented by the citizens of other towns, and sometimes with special invitations sent round to attract *Theoroi* from every Hellenic community,—and thus these once humble assemblages gradually swelled into the pomp and immense concourse of the Olympic and Pythian games. The city administering such holy ceremonies enjoyed inviolability of territory during the month of their convocation, being itself under obligation at that time to refrain from all aggression, as well as to notify by herald† the commencement of the truce to all other cities not in armed hostility with it. The imposed heavy fine upon other towns—even on the powerful Lacedæmonians—for violation of the Olympic truce, on pain of exclusion from the festival on one of non-payment.

\*The word *Theoria* means the act of going, especially to consult the gods, or to visit a temple. The word, however, has been used in a general sense to denote a journey or expedition, and in a special sense to denote a journey to a temple or to a festival. The word is also used in a general sense to denote a journey or expedition, and in a special sense to denote a journey to a temple or to a festival.

†The word *Theoria* means the act of going, especially to consult the gods, or to visit a temple. The word, however, has been used in a general sense to denote a journey or expedition, and in a special sense to denote a journey to a temple or to a festival. The word is also used in a general sense to denote a journey or expedition, and in a special sense to denote a journey to a temple or to a festival.

Sometimes this tendency to religious fraternity took a form called an *Amphitryony*, differed from the common <sup>Amphitryony</sup> festival. A certain number of towns entered into an exclusive religious partnership, for the celebration of sacrifices periodically in the god of a particular temple, which was supposed to be the common property and under the common protection of all, though one of the member was often named as permanent administrator; while all other Greeks were excluded. That there were many religious partnerships of this sort, which have never acquired a place in history, among the early Greek villages, we may perhaps gather from the etymology of the word (*Amphitryonia* designates *neighbours* around, or *neighbours*, considered in the point of view of fellow-religionists), as well as from the indications preserved to us as religious in various parts of the country. Thus there was an *Amphitryony*<sup>1</sup> of some cities at the holy island of *Idolonia*, close to the harbour of *Trochis*. *Tharakei*, *Epitauri*, *Signa*, *Athene*, *Prasia*, *Naxos*, and *Girchomene*, jointly maintained the temple and machinery of *Poseidon* in that island (with which it would seem that the city of *Trochis*, though close at hand, had no connection), meeting there at stated periods, to offer formal sacrifices. These seven cities indeed were not immediate neighbours, but the speciality and exclusiveness of their interest in the temple is seen from the fact, that when the Argonauts took *Naxos*, they adopted and fulfilled these religious obligations on behalf of the prior inhabitants: so also did the *Lacedæmonians* when they had captured *Prasia*. Again in *Trichyllia*,<sup>2</sup> situated between the *Placid* and *Mæssa* in the western part of *Peloponnesia*, there was a similar religious meeting and partnership of the *Trichyllians* on *Cape Samikon*, at the temple of the *Spartan Poseidon*. Here the inhabitants of *Mæssa* were entrusted with the details of superintendence, as well as with the duty of notifying beforehand the exact time of meeting to presences essential amidst the dissensions and irregularities of the Greek calendar, and also of prohibiting what was called the *Spartan truce*—a temporary abstinence from hostilities which bound all *Trichyllians* during the holy period. This latter custom discloses

<sup>1</sup> *Plutarch*, *idem*, *lib.* *ix.* *cap.* *xxv.*  
<sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, *lib.* *v.* *cap.* *xxv.*

<sup>3</sup> *Strabo*, *lib.* *v.* *cap.* *xxv.*  
<sup>4</sup> *Strabo*, *lib.* *v.* *cap.* *xxv.*

the solitary influence of such institutions in providing to men's

These  
institutions  
belonging  
to various  
regions.

which a common object of reverence, common duties, and common enjoyments; thus generating sympathies and feelings of mutual obligation which petty considerations not less fierce than envious.<sup>1</sup> As too, the

twelve chief towns either in and near Attica Minor had their Pan-Ionic Amphitryony peculiar to themselves: the six Boeot cities, in and near the southern corner of that peninsula, assembled for the like purpose at the temple of the Troopian Apollo; and the feeling of special partnership is here particularly illustrated by the fact, that Halikarnassus, one of the six, was formally extracted by the remaining five in consequence of a violation of the solemnity.<sup>2</sup> There was also an Amphitryony union at Ouchlata in Boeotia, in the wooded grove and temple at Fossida;<sup>3</sup> of whom it occurred we are not informed. There are some specimens of the sort of special religious associations and assemblies which seem to have been frequent throughout Greece. Nor ought we to omit those religious meetings and assembles which were common to all the members of one Hellenic subdivision, such as the Pan-Eretria to all the Eretrians, celebrated at the temple of the Nemean Apollo near Kerkira<sup>4</sup>—the common observance, rendered to the temple of Apollo Pythiaia at Argos, by all those neighbouring towns which had once been attached to the religious threat to the Argives—the similar periodical assemblies, frequented by all who bore the Achaean or Boeotian name—and the splendid and exhilarating festivals, so numerous to the

<sup>1</sup> At Ithaca, on the north coast of the Gulf of Pagos, and at the bottom of the Maritima, Thessalon, and Achaea, at Pythion, was celebrated a peculiar festival based on patriotism, the Hike of which are preserved from Athens and by the fragments of Herodotus's work (vol. II, p. 11). It seems to have been confined to Thessaly and Boeotia, and the members of Thessaly everywhere, which consisted in acts of the Pan-Ionic Amphitryony at Thessalon and Pythion, as here mentioned, and the last to Pythion (vol. II, p. 11). It seems to have been the same which celebrated the Hike (vol. II, p. 11) in the place of the

and Boeotia. Pothol conjectures the Boeotian assembly, but not the same from the fact that several names of the old city were preserved by those of the new, and that the festival celebrated in the new city was the same as the festival of the old city. But it seems to me not probable that a festival so general would be named after Pythion. It is probable to the Boeotian festival, and that of Pythion, which, as we have observed, was celebrated at Pythion, and at Pythion, but we cannot determine with certainty.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, II, p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Herodotus, II, p. 11; Strabo, II, p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Herodotus, II, p. 11.

diffusion of the early Greek poetry, which brought all Ionians at stated intervals to the sacred island of Delos.<sup>1</sup> This latter class of Ionians agreed with the Amphiktyons in being of a special and exclusive character, not open to all Greeks.

But there was not amongst these many Amphiktyones, which, though starting from the smallest beginning, gradually expanded into a comprehensive character, and acquired so marked a preponderance over the rest, as to be called The Amphiktyonic assembly, and even to have been mistaken by some authors for a sort of federal Hellenic Diet. Twelve sub-races, out of the number which make up entire Hellas, belonged to this ancient Amphiktyony, the meetings of which were held twice in every year: in spring at the temple of Apollo at Delphi; in autumn at Thermopylae, in the sacred precinct of Diaditir Amphiktyonia. Sacred disputes, including a chief called the Hieromanteln and subordinate called the Pythagers, attended at these meetings from each of the twelve races: a crowd of volunteers came to have accompanied them, for purposes of sacrifice, trade, or enjoyment. Their special and most important function consisted in watching over the Delphian temple, in which all the twelve sub-races had a joint interest, and it was the immense wealth and national ascendancy of this temple which enhanced to so great a pitch the dignity of its acknowledged administrators.

The twelve constituent members were as follow:—Thessalians, Boeotians, Dorians, Locrians, Parthians, Megarians, Laconians, Carians, Achæans, Phocians, Eolians, and Ilians.<sup>2</sup> All are counted as races (if we treat the Hellenes as a race, we must call them sub-races), no mention being made of others:<sup>3</sup> all count equally

which was called the Amphiktyonic League.

The twelve constituent members, and their mutual position.

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. ii. 104, 105, 106. Pausan. vii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Strabo. x. 4, 5. H. N. Euseb. Chron. 102.

<sup>2</sup> According to what seems to have been the custom and agreed together, the chiefs of the twelve sub-races met a time or twice during the summer, however, that was their principal or principal of the time of the Pythian Games and other. Pausan. vii. 102. It is likely to be doubted that there was a meeting of the chiefs of all the sub-races of the Hellenes at Delphi, as they were to have been a Hellenic Diet.

<sup>3</sup> The list of the Amphiktyonic assembly is different, given by Strabo, by Eusebius, and by Pausanias. Thucyd. vii. 104. Amphiktyonic League, p. 104. It contains but names of the twelve sub-races, and while the catalogue given in this text.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo, in his Catalogue, p. 104. H. N.—Amphiktyonic League, p. 104. It contains but names of the twelve sub-races, and while the catalogue given in this text.

in respect to voting, two votes being given by the deputies from each of the twelve: moreover, we are told that in determining the deputies to be sent or the manner in which the votes of each race should be given, the powerful Athens, Sparta, and Thebes had no more influence than the humblest Iosian, Doron, or Boeotian city. This latter fact is distinctly stated by *Herodotus*, himself a Pythagorean sent to Delphi by Athens. And so, doubtless, the theory of the case stood: the votes of the Ionic vote counted for neither more nor less than two, whether given by deputies from Athens, or from the small towns of Erythrae and Priene; and in like manner the Doron vote was as good in the division, when given by deputies from Doron and Rhyndakos in the little territory of Doria, as if the men delivering these had been Spartans. But there can be no little question that in practice the little Ionic cities and the little Doron cities pretended to no share in the Amphiktyonic deliberations. As the Ionic vote came to be substantially the vote of Athens, so, if Sparta was ever obstructed in the management of the Doron vote, it must have been by powerful Doron cities like Argos or Corinth, not by the insignificant towns of Doria. But the theory of Amphiktyonic settings as laid down by *Herodotus*, however little realized in practice during his day, is important inasmuch as it shows in full evidence the primitive and original constitution. The first establishment of the Amphiktyonic convention dates from a time when all the twelve members were on a footing of equal independence, and when there were no overwhelming cities (such as Sparta and Athens) to cast in the shade the humbler members—when Sparta was only one Doron city, and Athens only one Ionic city, among various others of consideration not much inferior.

There are also other proofs which show the high antiquity of this Amphiktyonic convention. *Herodotus* gives us an extract from the oath which had been taken by the several deputies who attended on behalf of their respective races, ever since its first establishment, and which still apparently continued to be taken in his day. The antique simplicity of this oath, and of the conditions to which the members bind themselves, betrays the early age in which it originated, as well as the humble resources of those

Antiquity  
of the  
Constitution  
described  
in the old  
oath.











not monopolized in it, but all of them had a right to make use of the temple of Delphi, and to contend at the Pythian and Olympic games. The Pythian games, celebrated near Delphi, were under the superintendence of the Amphiktyons,<sup>1</sup> or of some acting magistrate chosen by and possessed to represent them. Like the Olympic games, they came round every four years (the interval between one celebration and another being four complete years, which the Greeks called a *Penteteris*); the Isthmian and Nemean games returned every two years. In its first humble form of a competition among herds to sing a hymn in praise of Apollo, this festival was doubtless of commemorated antiquity;<sup>2</sup> but the first evidence of it dates Pan-Hellenic nationality (as I have already mentioned), the first multiplication of the subjects of competition, and the first introduction of a continuous record of the competitors, date only from the time when it came under the presidency of the Amphiktyons, at the close of the Sacred War against Karia. What is called the first Pythian contest coincides with the third year of the 49th Olympiad, or 548 B.C. From that period forward the games become crowded and celebrated; but the date just named, nearly two centuries after the first Olympiad, is a proof that the habit of periodical frequentation of festivals, by a number and from distant parts, ever so but slowly in the Greek world

The foundation of the temple of Delphi itself reaches far beyond all historical knowledge, forming one of the oldest of the religious institutions of Hellas. It is a sanctified and

1000

[illegible]

over 20 trailers, that also entered port with the other two larger container vessels. The 10,000-ton *Chang Hai* was the largest ship to arrive in the port since the 1990s. The ship was chartered by the Chinese government, and it was carrying a large amount of cargo, including a large amount of steel. The ship was also carrying a large amount of steel. The ship was also carrying a large amount of steel.







even regarded as westerly, naming *Nio-Hellene*.<sup>1</sup> Of such customs, indeed, at once common to all the Greeks, and peculiar to them as distinguished from others, we cannot specify a great number, but we may see enough to convince ourselves that there did really exist, in spite of local differences, a general Hellenic sentiment and character, which consisted among the remaining nations of a nation apparently as little united.

For we must reflect, that as respect to political sovereignty, complete division was among their most cherished principles. The only source of express violence to which a Greek felt respect and attachment, was to be sought within the walls of his own city. Authority could be sought only sought outside upon his home—ought procure for him increased security and advantage, as we shall have occasion hereafter to show with regard to Athens and her subject cities—might even be widely extended, and inspire no special aversion. But still the principle of it was repugnant to the natural sentiment of his mind, and he is always found gravitating towards the distant sovereignty of his own *Roûl* or *Polis*. This is a disposition common both to democracies and oligarchies, and operative even among the different towns belonging to the same subdivision of the Hellenic name—*Achéens*, *Phœliens*, *Eubœiens*, &c. The twelve *Achéens* cities are homogeneous cities, with a perpetual feeling which partakes of the character of a congress,—but equal and independent political communities. The *Eubœian* towns, under the presidency of *Thébes*, their reputed metropolis, recognise certain common obligations, and share, on various particular matters, common offices named *Proxarches*,—but we shall see, in this as in other cases, the unbridled tendencies constantly modifying themselves, and resisted chiefly by the interests and power of *Thébes*. That great, successful, and fortunate revolution which merged the several independent political communities of Athens into the single unity of Athens, took place before the time of authentic history. It is connected with the name of the hero *Thésens*, but we know not how it was effected, while its comparatively large size and extent render it a singular exception to Hellenic tendencies generally.

<sup>1</sup> *Thucyd.* l. v. ; *Strabo*, l. ix.



Political division—sovereign authority within the city—was thus forced a settled maxim in the Greek mind. The relation between one city and another was an international relation, not a relation subsisting between members of a common political aggregate. Within a few miles from his own city-walls, an Athenian found himself in the territory of another city, wherein he was nothing more than an alien,—where he could not acquire property in house or land, nor contract a legal marriage with any native woman, nor sue for legal protection against injury except through the mediation of some friendly citizen. The right of intermarriage and of acquiring landed property was occasionally granted by a city to some individual non-free-man, or master of special favour, and sometimes (though very rarely) reciprocated generally between two separate cities.<sup>1</sup> But the obligations between one city and another, or between the citizens of the one and the citizens of the other, are all matters of special arrangement, agreed to by the sovereign authority in each. Such coexistence of entire political sovereigns, with so much fellowship in other ways, is perplexing in modern ideas; and modern language is not well furnished with expressions to describe Greek political phenomena. We may say that an Athenian citizen was an alien when he arrived as a visitor in Corinth, but we can hardly say that he was a foreigner; and though the relations between Corinth and Athens were in principle international, yet that word would be obviously unsuitable to the conscious petty consciousness of Hellas, besides that we require it for describing the relations of Hellas generally with Persians or Carthaginians. We are compelled to use a word such as *interpolitical*, to describe the transactions between separate Greek cities, so numerous in the course of this history.

As, on the one hand, a Greek will not consent to look for sovereign authority beyond the limits of his own city, so, on the other hand, he must have a city to look to: scattered villages will not satisfy in his mind the exigencies of social order, security, and dignity. Through the consciousness of smaller towns

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, *POL.* II. 2, 11. It is individual non-free-men the right of intermarriage to, rather than the master, foreigner and freeman, being the only cases upon which

into a larger is repugnant to her feelings, that of villages into a town appears to her a moral advance in the scale of civilization. Such at least is the governing sentiment of Greece throughout the historical period, for there was always a certain portion of the Hellenic aggregate—the richest and least advanced among them—who lived in unfortified villages, and upon whom the citizens of Athens, Corinth, or Thebes looked down as inferiors. Such village residence was the character of the Spartans universally, and prevailed throughout Hellas itself as late very early and even into Homeric times upon which Thucydides looked back as gloriously barbarous,—a state of universal poverty and insecurity,—absence of public intercourse,—petty warfare and plunder, compelling every man to pass his life armed,—ruthless migration without any local attachments. Many of the considerable cities of Greece are mentioned as aggregations of pre-existing villages, some of them in towns comparatively recent. Tegea and Mantinea in Arcadia represent in this way the confederacy of eight villages and five villages respectively; Syon in Achæia was brought together out of eight villages, and like in the same manner, at a period even later than the Persian invasion;<sup>1</sup> the like seems to have happened with Megara and Thebes. A large proportion of the Arcadians continued their village life down to the time of the battle of Leuctra, and it suited the purposes of Sparta to keep them thus distracted; a policy which we shall see hereafter illustrated by the dismemberment of Mantinea (into its primitive component villages) which the Spartan contemporaries of Agamemnon carried into effect, but which was reversed as soon as the power of Sparta was no longer paramount,—as well as by the foundation of Megalopolis out of a large number of petty Arcadian towns and villages, one of the capital measures of Epaminondas.<sup>2</sup> As the

subject  
prevalent  
in Greece  
village  
residence  
is looked  
down upon  
as an  
inferior  
social  
state.

<sup>1</sup> *Strabo*, *Geogr.* v. 10—11; *Thucyd.* i. 10. See also *Strabo*, *Geogr.* vi. 4. *Strabo*, ii. 10, states that the Spartans brought eight towns into the Peloponnese, and that the Arcadians did the same. *Strabo*, vi. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

<sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, vi. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

The description of the capture of Mantinea in *Strabo*, *Geogr.* vi. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.







are now proved to be—*as* were proved to Herodotus and Thucydides even in their age—on which to build trustworthy affirmations respecting the auto-Hellenic Pelagians. And where such is the case, we may without improperly apply the remark of Herodotus respecting one of the theories which he had heard for explaining the translation of the Holo by a supposed connection with the circumlocution *Grecan*—that "the man who carries up his story into the invisible world passes out of the range of criticism."<sup>1</sup>

As far as our knowledge extends, there were no towns or villages called Pelagion, in Greece Proper, about 778 before <sup>Christ</sup> <sup>1800</sup>. But there still existed in two different places, Pelagion even in the age of Herodotus, people whom he believed to be Pelagians. One portion of them occupied the towns of Pichia and Glykidi near Kythira, on the Propontis; another dwelt in a town called Erichia, near the Thracian Gulf.<sup>2</sup> There were moreover various other Pelagian townships which he does not specify—at some indeed, from Thucydides, that there were some little Pelagian townships on the peninsula of Attika.<sup>3</sup> Now Herodotus equates us with the remarkable fact, that the people of Erichia, those of Pichia and Glykidi, and those of the other unnamed Pelagian townships, all spoke the same language, and each of them respectively, a different language from their neighbours around them. He informs us, moreover, that their language was a barbarous (i.e., a non-Hellenic) language; and this fact he quotes as an evidence to prove that the ancient Pelagian language was a barbarous language, or distinct from the Hellenic. He at the same time states expressly that he has no positive knowledge what language the ancient Pelagians spoke—one proof, among others, that no memorials nor means of distinct information concerning that people could have been open to him.

This is the one single fact, amidst so many conjectures con-

<sup>1</sup> Herodot. II. 107-108, 111, 112, and Thucyd. along the coast and other countries, etc. See before.

<sup>2</sup> That Erichia is the same as Erichia in Thucydides (see above) along the coast in Thucydides (see above) Thucyd. II. 107-108, 111, 112, etc.—the name of the peninsula of Attika is given at the bottom.

<sup>3</sup> Thucyd. II. 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

concerning the Paléangans, which we can be said to know upon the testimony of a contemporary and contemporary witness: the few townships—scattered and unnumberable, but all that Herodotus in his day knew as Paléangan—spoke a barbarous language. And upon such a point he need be regarded as an excellent judge. If then (unless the Paléangan of the early Paléangians spoke the same language as those of Kikula and Pukia, they must have changed their language at the time when they passed into the Hellenic category, to become Hellenic. Now Herodotus conceives that category to have been gradually enlarged to its great actual size by incorporating with itself not only the Paléangians, but several other nations once barbarous;<sup>2</sup> the Hellenic having been originally an inconsiderable people. Among those other nations once barbarous whom Herodotus supposes to have become Hellenic, we may perfectly number the Lolopes, and with respect to them as well as to the Paléangians, we have contemporary testimony proving the existence of barbarous Lolopes in later times. Ptolemy the Karian historian asserted the present existence, and believed in the past existence, of Lolopes in his country as well as dependent cultivators under the Karians, analogous to the Helens in Ionia or the Prasians in Thracia.<sup>3</sup> We may be very sure that there

historical  
Lolopes  
barbarous  
in language  
then  
were no Hellenic—no man speaking the Hellenic tongue—standing in such a relation to the Karians. Among these many barbarous-speaking nations whom Herodotus believed to have changed their language and passed into Hellenic, we may therefore fairly consider the Lolopes to have been included. For next to the Paléangians and Paléangs, the Lolopes and Lolop figures most conspicuously in the legendary genealogies; and both together cover the larger portion of the Hellenic soil.

Consulting myself to historical evidence and believing that no sound result can be derived from the attempt to transform legend into history, I accept the statement of Herodotus with confidence as to the barbarous language spoken by the Paléangians of his day, and I believe the same with regard to the historical

<sup>1</sup> Herod. 1. 97. *ἡγεμονεύοντες αὐτῶν οἱ Ἕλληνες*—*dominating* *them* *the* *Hellenes*. *οἱ Ἕλληνες* *οὐκ ἔστιν ἑνὸς ὀνόματος ἀλλὰ πολλῶν*—*the* *Hellenes* *are* *not* *of* *one* *name* *but* *of* *many*. *οἱ Ἕλληνες* *οὐκ ἔστιν ἑνὸς ὀνόματος ἀλλὰ πολλῶν*—*the* *Hellenes* *are* *not* *of* *one* *name* *but* *of* *many*. *οἱ Ἕλληνες* *οὐκ ἔστιν ἑνὸς ὀνόματος ἀλλὰ πολλῶν*—*the* *Hellenes* *are* *not* *of* *one* *name* *but* *of* *many*.







we neither possess proof, nor ground for probability, that there were any such, though traces of Phœnician settlements in some of the islands may doubtless be pointed out. And if we examine the character and aptitude of Greek, as compared either with Egyptian or Phœnician, it will appear that there is not only no analogy, but an obvious and fundamental contrast: the Greek may occasionally be traced as a borrower from these alien tongues contemporaries, but he cannot be looked upon as their offspring or derivative. Nor can I bring myself to accept an hypothesis which implies (unless we are to regard the supposed foreign languages as very few in number, in which case the question loses most of its importance) that the Hellenic language—the richest among the many varieties of human speech, and presenting within itself a pervading symmetry and equilibrium,—is a mere confluence of two foreign barbaric languages (Phœnician and Egyptian) with two or more internal barbaric languages—Pelagian, Lelapian, &c. In the mode of investigation pursued by different historians into this question of early foreign colonies, there is great difference (as in the case of the Pelagi) between different authors—from the acquiescent Eusebius of Cæsaræa to the refined subtilties of Dr. Thirlwall in the third chapter of his *History*. It will be found that the amount of positive knowledge which Dr. Thirlwall guarantees to his readers in that chapter is extremely unimpressive; for though he proceeds upon the general theory (different from that which I hold) that historical matter may be distinguished and elicited from the legends, yet when the questions arise respecting any definite historical result, his cases of credibility are too just to permit him to overlook the absence of positive evidence; even when all inherent incredulity is removed. That which I note as Torre Inscrita is in his view a land which may be known as to a certain point; but the map which he draws of it contains no few unsustained places as to differ very little from absolute vacancy.

The most ancient district called *Hellas* is affirmed by Aristotle to have been near *Edessa* and the river *Aschelus*—a description which would have been intelligible <sup>from context.</sup> (since the river does not flow near *Edessa*, if it had <sup>been called Aschelus.</sup> not been qualified by the remark, that the river had often in former times changed its course. He states moreover



## CHAPTER III.

MEMBERS OF THE HELLINIC AGGREGATE, SEPARATELY  
TAKEN.—GREEK NORTH OF PELOPONNESUS.

HAVING in the preceding chapter touched upon the Greeks in their aggregate capacity, I now come to describe separately the portions of which this aggregate consisted, as they present themselves at the first discernible period of history.

It has already been mentioned that the twelve races or subdivisions, members of what is called the Amphiktyonic <sup>Agggregate</sup> <sup>the race.</sup> confederation, were as follows :—

North of the pass of Thermopylæ,—Thespians, Parianians, Magnesians, Achæans, Molians, Boeotians, Delians.

South of the pass of Thermopylæ,—Dorians, Ionians, Eolians, Lokrians, Phocians.

Other Hellenic races, not comprised among the Amphiktyons, were—

The Medians and Akarnanians, north of the Gulf <sup>Therian</sup> <sup>Politian</sup> <sup>race.</sup> of Corinth.

The Arcadians, Elians, Pisani, and Triphylians, in the central and western portion of Peloponnesus: I do not here name the Achæans, who occupied the southern or Peloponnesian coast of the Corinthian gulf, because they may be presumed to have been originally of the same race as the Pelopon Achæans, and therefore participate in the Amphiktyonic constitution, though their actual connexion with it may have been dissolved.

The Dryopes, an inconsiderable, but strangely peculiar subdivision, who occupied some scattered points on the sea-coast—Hæmonæ on the Argolic peninsula; Sipros and Eurytos in Eubœa; the island of Kythira, &c.

Though it may be said, in a general way, that our historical

disseverment of the Hellenic aggregate, apart from the tradition  
 of legend, commences with 776 B.C., yet with regard  
 to the larger number of its subdivisions just enumerated,  
 we can hardly be said to possess any specific  
 facts anterior to the invasion of Xerxes in 480 B.C.  
 Until the year 480 B.C. (the epoch of Greece in Asia Minor, and  
 of Plataea at Athens), the history of the Greeks presents  
 hardly anything of a collective character: the movements of each  
 portion of the Hellenic world begin and end apart from the rest.  
 The destruction of Eliria by the Amphiktyons is the first  
 historical incident which brings into play, in defence of the  
 Delphian temple, a common Hellenic feeling of active obligation.

But about 480 B.C., two important changes are seen to come  
 into operation which alter the character of Grecian  
 history—uniting it out of its former state of  
 detail, and centralising its isolated phenomena:—1.  
 The subjugation of the Asiatic Greeks by Lydia and  
 by Persia, followed by their struggles for emancipation—wherein  
 the European Greeks became implicated, first as accessories, and  
 afterwards as principals. 2. The combined action of the large  
 mass of Greeks under Sparta, as their most powerful state and  
 acknowledged chief, succeeded by the rapid and extraordinary  
 growth of Athens, the complete development of Grecian military  
 power, and the struggle between Athens and Sparta for the  
 leadership. These two causes, though distinct in themselves, must  
 nevertheless be regarded as working together to a certain degree  
 —or rather the second grew out of the first. For it was the  
 Persian invasions of Greece which first gave birth to a wide-spread  
 alarm and sympathy among the leading Greeks (we mean not  
 all in Pan-Hellene, since more than half of the Amphiktyons  
 constantly gave earth and water to Xerxes) against the bar-  
 barians of the East, and impressed them with the necessity of  
 joint active operations under a leader. The idea of a leadership  
 or hegemony of collective Hellas, as a privilege necessarily vested  
 in some one state for common security against the barbarians,  
 thus became current—an idea foreign to the mind of Hellas, as  
 say one of the same age. Next came the miraculous development  
 of Athens, and the violent contest between her and Sparta which  
 should be the leader; the larger portion of Hellas taking side



under Macedonian rule, and to the extent of all native Hellas—the *Attika* movement. Some few individuals are indeed found, even in the third century B.C., worthy of the best times of Hellas, and the *Attika* confederates of that century is no honorable attempt to extend against inevitable difficulties; but on the whole, that free, social, and political march, which gives so much interest to the earlier centuries, is permanently halted from Greece after the generation of Alexander the Great.

The foregoing brief sketch will show that, taking the period from Greece and Persia down to the generation of Alexander (350—300 B.C.), the phenomena of Hellas generally, and her relations both foreign and internal, admit of being grouped together in masses with essential dependence on one or a few predominant circumstances. They may be said to constitute a sort of historical epoch, analogous to that which Herodotus has constructed out of the wars between Greece and barbarians from the legends of It and Nestor down to the capture of Xerxes. But when we are called back to the period between 700 and 500 B.C., the phenomena brought to our knowledge are so many in number—containing few common feelings or interests, and no tendency towards any one assignable purpose. To impart attraction to this first period, we choose and representing, we shall be compelled to consider it in its relation with the second, partly as a preparation, partly as a contrast.

Of the extra-Peloponnesian Greeks north of Attika, during these five centuries, we know absolutely nothing; but it will be possible to furnish some information respecting the early condition and struggles of the great Doric states in Peloponnesus, and respecting the rise of Sparta from the second to the first place in the comparative scale of Greek power. Attika becomes first known to us as the legislature of Draco and the attempt of Kylon (600 B.C.) to make himself despot, and we gather some facts concerning the Ionic cities in Euboea and Asia Minor during the century of their chief prosperity, prior to the reign and conquests of Croesus. In this way we shall form to ourselves some idea of the growth of Sparta and Attika,—of the short-lived and energetic development of the Ionic Greeks—and

Department  
of Education  
Bellevue  
High School  
New York  
City  
1888

John P.  
Gibson  
Library  
of the  
City of  
New York  
1888

of the slow working of these causes which tended to bring about increased Hellenic intercommunication—as contrasted with the enlarged range of activities, the great Pan-Hellenic cities, the acknowledged party-distinctions, and the untrammelled action both abroad and at home, which grew out of the contact with Persia.

There were also two or three remarkable manifestations which will require special notice during this first period of Grecian history:—1. The great multiplicity of colonies sent forth by individual cities, and the rise and progress of these several colonies; 2. The number of despots who arose in the various Grecian cities; 3. The lyric poetry; 4. The refinements of that which afterwards ripened into moral philosophy, as manifested in *gnomes* or *aphorisms*—or the age of the famous *Wise Men*.

But before I proceed to relate these earliest proceedings (unfortunately too few) of the Grecians and Ionians during the historical period, together with the other matters just alluded to, it will be convenient to go over the names and positions of those other Grecian cities respecting which we have no information during these first two centuries. Some of these will thus be found of the less important members of the Hellenic aggregate previous to the time when they will be called into action. We begin by the territory north of the pass of Thermopylae.

Of the different cases who dwell between this celebrated pass and the mouth of the river Peneius, by far the most powerful and important were the *Thespians*. Sometimes indeed the whole of this area passes under the name of *Thebes*—thus incorrectly, though not always really, the power of the *Thespians* extended over the whole. We know that the *Trachinians*, founded by the *Lacedæmonians* in the early years of the Peloponnesian war close to the pass of Thermopylae, were planted upon the territory of the *Thespians*.<sup>1</sup> But there were also within these limits other cities, inferior and dependent on the *Thespians*, yet still to be of more ancient date, and certainly not less genuine aborigines of the Hellenic race. The *Partholoi*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. II. 95. Cf. Herodotus, l. c. Herodotus states the cause of the war, and the fact of the founding of *Trachis*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, vi. 410. *Strabo*, l. c.

<sup>3</sup> *Strabo*, l. c. *Strabo* follows the pass from the state of *Thespiæ* to the *Trachinians* mentioned by *Thucyd.* I. 92, and the early period out of *Thespiæ*.



occupied the northern portion of the territory between the lower courses of the river Peneios and Mount Olympus. The *Magnates*<sup>1</sup> dwelt along the eastern coast, between Mount Ossa and Pelion on one side and the *Ngigas* on the other, comprising the south-eastern cape and the eastern coast of the Gulf of Pagasæ as far as Salamis. The *Achéans* occupied the territory called *Phthiotis*, extending from near Mount Pinios on the west to the Gulf of Pagasæ on the east—along the mountain chain of Othrys with its lateral projections northerly into the Thessalian plain, and southerly even to its junction with Ossa. The three tribes of the *Hellæes* dwelt between Achæan Phthiotis and Thermopylæ, including both *Trachinæ* and *Boeotidæ*. Westward of Achæan Phthiotis, the left region of Pinios or *Tymphrestos*, with its declivities both westerly and easterly, was occupied by the *Dolopes*.

All these five tribes or subdivisions—*Phthiotidæ*, *Magnatæ*, *Thessaliæ*, *Achéans* of *Phthiotis*, *Hellæes*, and *Dolopæ*, together with certain *Epîrotes* and *Macedonian* tribes bordering beyond the boundaries of Peneios and Olympus—were in a state of irregular dependence upon the *Thessaliæ*, who occupied the central plain or basin drained by the Peneios. That river receives the streams from Olympus, from Pinios, and from Othrys—flowing through a region which was supposed by its inhabitants to have been once a lake, until Peneios cut open the hills of *Tanph*, through which the waters found an efflux. In travelling northward from Thermopylæ, the commencement of this fertile region—the simplest space of land continuously productive which *Hellæe* presents—is strikingly marked by the steep rock and ancient fortress of *Thessalîn*,<sup>2</sup> from whence the traveller, passing over the mountains of Achæan Phthiotis and Othrys, sees before him the plains and low declivities which reach northward across Thessaly to Olympus. A narrow strip of coast—in the interior of the Gulf of Pagasæ, between the *Magnatæ* and the *Achéans*, and containing the towns of *Amphicleron* and

<sup>1</sup> *See* the description of the coast and the neighbouring country in Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, 2d. edit. vol. ii. p. 278-282, compare *ibid.* p. 281.

<sup>2</sup> *Thessalîn*, *Thessalîn*, s. 48; *Thessalîn*, s. 127-128.

<sup>3</sup> *Thessalîn*, *Thessalîn*, s. 48; *Thessalîn*, s. 127-128. *Thessalîn* included the

territory of *Thessalîn* in the State of *Phthiotis* (*ibid.* s. 48). *Thessalîn* contains *Phthiotis* as a whole, s. 48, south of the river *Thessalîn* (*ibid.* s. 48).

<sup>4</sup> *See* the description of *Thessalîn* in *ibid.* s. 48, and in *ibid.* *Thessalîn* (*ibid.* s. 48, vol. ii. p. 127-see *Thessalîn*).



their extensive lands on the plain, known for the justice which  
These Thracian cities exhibit the extreme of barbarous oligarchy,  
economically trampled down by some one man of great vigour, but  
little tempered by that sense of political consciousness and reverence  
for established law, which was found among the better cities of  
Hellas. Both in Athens and Sparta, so different in many respects  
from each other, this feeling well is found, if not indeed constantly  
prevalent, yet constantly present and operative. Both of these  
exhibit a contrast with Larissa or Pheræ not unlike that between  
Rome and Capua—the former with her endless civil disputes  
Thracian constitutionally conducted, exhibiting the joint action  
of parties against a common foe: the latter with her  
oligarchy and enriching a luxurious oligarchy, and expelled  
according to the fable of her great propitiation, the Magi, Eleusis,  
and Pholoei.<sup>1</sup>

The Thracians are noticed in their character and capacity as  
made Epicure or Macedonian as Bellenic, forming a sort of link  
between the two. For the Macedonians, though trained in after-  
times upon Grecian principles by the genius of Philip and Alex-  
ander, so as to constitute the celebrated heavy-armed phalanx,  
were originally (even in the Ptolemaean war) distinguished  
chiefly for the excellence of their cavalry, like the Thracians;<sup>2</sup>  
while the broad-brimmed hat or *kappa*, and the short spreading  
mantle or *chiton*, were common to both.

We are told that the Thracians were originally immigrants  
from Thraciæ in Epirus, and conquerors of the place of the  
Pœonia, which (according to Herodotus) was then called *Stala*,  
and which they found occupied by the Pelagi.<sup>3</sup> It may be  
doubted whether the great Thracian families—such as the  
Alexander of Larissa, descendants from Nicobola, and placed by  
Pindar on the same level as the Lacedæmonian kings—would  
have admitted this Thraciæ origin; nor does it coincide with  
the tenor of those legends which make the epicure, Thracian,

<sup>1</sup> See *Charmides* in *Plato*, p. 141. See  
also *Agamemnon* and *Odyssey*, c. 11, 12.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the Thracian cavalry as  
described by Ptolemy, l. c. 8, with the  
Macedonian as described by Poly-  
bius, l. c. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Herodotus*, vi. 127. Thucyd. i. 10.

<sup>4</sup> *Thucyd.*, viii. p. 101. with the  
parallel, and the military character of  
Pindar, in reference to the Pelagi;  
see also *Agamemnon*, *Odyssey*, p. 1, 12,  
and the *General Introduction*, Vol. I.  
See also *Thucyd.*, viii. 101, 102,  
103, 104, 105, of the collection called  
"Mythology".

one of *Ekidima*. Moreover it is to be remarked, that the language of the *Thasians* was *Helianic*, a variety of the *Helic* dialect; the same (so far as we can make out) as that of the people whom they must have found settled in the country at their first conquest. If then it be true, that at some period anterior to the commencement of a barbaric history, a body of *Thaspeian* warriors crossed the passes of *Pindus*, and established themselves as conquerors in *Thrace*, we must suppose them to have been more warlike than courageous, and to have gradually deep their primitive ferocity.

In other respects, the conditions of the population of Thessaly, such as we find it during the historical period, favour the supposition of an original mixture of conquerors and conquered; for it seems that there was among the Thessians and their dependents a triple gradation, somewhat analogous to that of Livonia. First, a class of rich proprietors distributed throughout the principal cities, possessing most of the soil, and constituting separate oligarchies loosely hanging together.<sup>1</sup> Next the subject nobles, Magisteri, Perakiti, different from the *laconici Perakiti*, in this point, that they retained their ancient titles and separate Amphiktyonic functions. Thirdly, a class of rich or dependent cultivators, corresponding to the *laconici Ekolo*, who, till the basis of the wealthy oligarchy, laid over a proportion of its produce, furnished the retinue by which these great families were surrounded, served as their followers in the cavalry, and were in a condition of vassalage,—yet with the important reserve that they could not be sold out of the country.

[illegible]

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd, *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 103–110

Two seeds collected by Elizabeth Orloff, 21 E. 21st St. in 1966, of 1966, and the State of Minnesota, Vol. 10, 1966, are deposited in the herbarium of the Minnesota Museum, and the other two seeds are deposited in the herbarium of the University of Minnesota. Both seeds have been deposited in the herbarium of the University of Minnesota, and the other two seeds are deposited in the herbarium of the University of Minnesota. Both seeds have been deposited in the herbarium of the University of Minnesota, and the other two seeds are deposited in the herbarium of the University of Minnesota.

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

dead to its hydrophobicity (Peters, 1977) must be revised, and not of the theory of the almost-uniform electrolytic potential in phospholipid bilayers, and indeed of the theory of the almost-uniform lipid potential in phospholipid bilayers and membranes, as proposed by the author (1978a,b,c,d), in keeping with the evidence of the thermodynamic, statistical, and kinetic, etc., data.

\_\_\_\_\_

Figure was submitted as a short  
advertising for a new (developed by  
Lundberg) etc.

Months of planning led to the January 1992 inauguration with 100,000 in attendance.



Who the people were, whom the conquest of Thebes by the Theoproteans reduced to this pastoral village, we find differently stated. According to Theopompus, <sup>1</sup> *Phaenici* they were Perinthians and Megarians; according to <sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, others, Peloponnesians; while Arrhenianus alleged them to have been Boeotians of the territory of Arne<sup>3</sup>—some assigning to escape the conquerors, others concealing and accepting the condition of serfs. But the conquest, assuming it as a fact, occurred at too early a day to allow of our making out either the manner in which it came to pass or the state of things which preceded it. The Peloponnesians whom Herodotus saw at Keteia are affirmed by him to have been the descendants of those who quitted Thebes to escape<sup>4</sup> the revelling Theoproteans; though others held that the Boeotians, driven on this coast from their habitations on the Gulf of Pagasæ near the Achæans of Pithulæ, perpetrated themselves on Onchestos and Boeotiæ, and settled in it, smothering the Minæ and the Peloponnesians.

Passing over the legends on this subject, and confining ourselves to historical time, we find an established quadripartite division of Thessaly, said to have been introduced in the time of Alcmaea, the ancestor (real or mythical) of the powerful Alcmaeonidae.—Thessaliotis, Peloponnis, Hæmatia, Phthiotis.<sup>1</sup> In Phthiotis were comprehended the Achæonæ, whose chief towns were Mikiænæ, Mikiænæ, Thesæ Phthiotidæ, Alivæ, Larissæ, Kremastæ and Pælion, on or near the western coast of the Gulf of Pagasæ. Hæmatia, to the north of the Pælionæ

1 *Therapsomys* and *Gambusia* sp.  
Agassiz, V, p. 164-165. *Journal*  
*Geology*, 1843, p. 164-165. *Journal*  
The museum of this paper is in the  
p. 164-165. of the *Journal*  
being treated as *Therapsomys*. The  
Therapsomys and *Gambusia* were originally  
described from the *Therapsomys* *Gambusia*  
*Gambusia* *Gambusia* *Gambusia* *Gambusia*  
Therapsomys, as per by Agassiz, p. 164, 165.  
They had, they appeared *Therapsomys*  
*Therapsomys*, whose *Therapsomys* was found in  
*Therapsomys* *Therapsomys* *Therapsomys* *Therapsomys*  
this *Therapsomys* with *Therapsomys*  
of the *Therapsomys* *Therapsomys* *Therapsomys*  
New York.

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd, *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 103–110

**Fluorescence** *Fluores.* **Fl.** **Fl.** **Fluores.**  
**Fluorescence** *Fluores.* **Fl.** **Fl.** **Fluores.**



was employed by members of the native dignity,<sup>1</sup> or even by foreign states, for the purpose of bringing about political revolutions.

"When Thamyris is under her Tegyra, all the neighbouring people pay tribute to her; she can send into the field 4000 cavalry and infantry, light or heavy-armed infantry," observed Justin, despot of Flavia, to Poliphaemus of Phocæia, in endeavouring to prevail on the latter to second his pretensions to that dignity. The impost due from the tributaries, seemingly considerable, was then collected with care, and the duties upon imports at the harbours of the Tegyran gulf, imposed for the benefit of the confederacy, were then enforced with strictness; but the observation shows that while vigorous Thamyris was very powerful, her periods of weakness were only occasional.<sup>2</sup> Among the nations which then paid tribute to the claims of Thessalian power, we may number not merely the Perrhebiæ, Magnetiæ, and Achaïniæ of Phthiotis, but also the Mallians and Dolopes, and various tribes of Epirus extending to the westward of Phthia.<sup>3</sup>

Great power of Thamyris, when in a state of weakness.

We may remark that they were all (except the Mallians) javelin-men or light-armed troops, not serving in rank with the full peasantry; a fact which in Greece counts as presumptive evidence of a lower civilization; the Magnetiæ, too, had a peculiar descending mode of dress, probably suited to movements in a mountainous country.<sup>4</sup> There was even a time when the Thessalian power threatened to extend westward of Thermopylæ, and subjugate the Phocians, Dorians, and Locrisæ. So much was the Phocians alarmed at this danger, that they had built a wall across the pass of Thermopylæ for the purpose of more easily defending it against

<sup>1</sup> Xenophon, *Hæcæcæ*, l. 2, c. 10; *Hæcæcæ*, l. 2, c. 10. The loss of the property called *Stagæ* or *Stagæ* (see *Strabo*, *Geogr.*, l. 10, c. 10) is still probably preserved in some words denoting the process of *Stagæ* (see *Strabo*, *Geogr.*, l. 10, c. 10) about the republication of *Amorion* among the *Phocians* of *Phthia*: but the *Stagæ* were applied to men belonging to do with the property of *Stagæ*, instead of to *Stagæ*.

<sup>2</sup> Xenophon, *Hæcæcæ*, l. 2, c. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Xenophon, *Hæcæcæ*, l. 2, c. 10, p. 10. The latter had tribute

to *Stagæ* (see *Strabo*, *Geogr.*, l. 10, c. 10) as having got possession of the point of view of the *Phocians* confederacy, partly by *Stagæ*, partly by *Stagæ*, and we thus have the *Stagæ* and the *Stagæ* which formed the nucleus of the *Stagæ*.

<sup>4</sup> Xenophon, *Hæcæcæ*, l. 2, c. 10. The *Stagæ* were the *Stagæ* among these *Stagæ* along with the *Stagæ*; the *Stagæ* are named by *Strabo*, l. 10, c. 10. It also shows that the *Stagæ* were the *Stagæ* which formed the nucleus of the *Stagæ*.

<sup>5</sup> Xenophon, *Hæcæcæ*, l. 2, c. 10, p. 10.



Thracian invaders, who are reported to have penetrated more than once into the Phokian valleys, and to have performed some serious depredations.<sup>1</sup> At what period these events happened, we find no information; but it must have been considerably earlier than the invasion of Xerxes, since the defensive wall which had been built at Thermopylae by the Phocians was found by Leonidas in a state of ruin. But the Phocians, though they no longer felt the necessity of keeping up this wall, had not ceased to fear and hate the Thracians—an antipathy which will be found to manifest itself palpably in connection with the Persian invasion. On the whole the resistance of the Phocians was successful, for the power of the Thracians never reached southward of the pass.

It will be recalled that three different names were,—  
 Achæans, Perinthians, Magnesians, Achæans, Molians, Dolopians,—  
 though inhabitants of the Thracianæ, still retained  
 their Amphiktyonic franchises, and were considered  
 as legitimate Hellènes; all except the Molians are  
 indeed mentioned in the *Iliad*. We shall rarely have  
 occasion to speak much of them in the course of this  
 history: they are found siding with Xerxes (chiefly  
 by constraint) in his attack of Greece, and almost  
 indifferent in the struggle between Sparta and Athens. That  
 the Achæans of Phokian are a portion of the same race as the  
 Achæans of Peloponnesus it seems reasonable to believe, though  
 we have no historical evidence to substantiate it. Achæa  
 Phokiotis is the seat of Halkis, the patriarch of the entire race,<sup>2</sup>  
 of the primitive Halkia, by some treated as a town, by others as  
 a district of some breadth,—and of the great national hero  
 Achilles. His connection with the Peloponnesian Achæans is not  
 unlike that of Dêros with the Peloponnesian Dorians.<sup>3</sup>

We have also to notice another ethnic kindred, the date and  
 circumstances of which are given to us only in a mythical form,  
 but which seems nevertheless to be in itself a reality,—that of  
 the Magnesians or Pelion and Ossa, with the two divisions of

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, vii. 126; viii. 27-28, &c.

<sup>2</sup> The story of Achilles, Thracianæ  
 28. Numerous near Leonidas, in Greece.

<sup>3</sup> Pausanias, vi. 26, 27 is somewhat probably.

It seems very clear, that these Achæans  
 of Phokian were not Peloponnesian Achæans,  
 Phokian, and settled in Achæa Phokiotis,  
 viii. 2, 282.



a qualified citizen who either had served, or was serving, in the ranks with his full pauply.<sup>1</sup> Yet the pauply was probably not perfectly suitable to the mountainous regions by which they were surrounded; for at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, the aggressive mountainers of the neighbouring region of Cithæ had so harassed and overwhelmed them in war, that they were forced to throw themselves on the protection of Sparta, and the establishment of the Spartan colony of Herakleæ near Trachis was the result of their urgent application. Of these mountainers, described under the general name of *Oronæ*, the principal were

The *Oronæ*.

—The

*Oronæ*.

the *Oronæ* (or *Trachis*, as they are termed in the Homeric Catalogue as well as by Herodotus),—an ancient Hellenic<sup>2</sup> Amphiktyonic race, who are said to

have passed through several successive migrations in Thessaly and Ephyra, but who in the historical times had their settlement and their chief town Hydruntis in the upper valley of the Sperchios, on the northern declivity of Mount Oita. But other tribes were probably also included in the name, such as those *Oronæ* tribes, the *Oronæ* and *Kallianæ*, whose high and cold ridges approached near to the Helian Gulf. It is in this sense that we are to understand the name, as comprehending all the predatory tribes along the extensive mountain range, when we are told of the damage done by the *Oronæ* both to the *Malians* on the east, and to the *Dacians* on the south: but there are some cases in which the name *Oronæ* seems to designate expressly the *Oronæ*, especially when they are mentioned as invading the Amphiktyonic frontier.<sup>3</sup>

The fine soil, abundant moisture, and genial exposure of the southern declivities of Othrys<sup>4</sup>—especially the valley of the Sperchios, through which drive all these waters past away, and which usually gives birth a fertilizing inundation—presents a marked contrast with the barren, craggy, and naked masses of

<sup>1</sup> Aristot. Polit. iv. 13, 14.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, *Geographica* lib. v. 54.

<sup>3</sup> Thucyd. lib. ii. 97—99. viii. 5. Herodotus, *Geographica* lib. v. 14, in another passage describes expressly the Oronæ as the chief and most powerful of the Oronæ and the *Oronæ* tribes, lib. v. 14. Herodotus, *Geographica* lib. v. 14. Herodotus, *Geographica* lib. v. 14, p. 104.

<sup>4</sup> About the fertility as well as the

beauty of this valley, see Dr. Mitchell's *Travels*, ch. 179. 180. p. 104. and *Travels* (London, 1804). *Travels*, lib. v. 14, p. 104. *Travels*, lib. v. 14, p. 104. I do not mean to mention the myth of *Oronæ*, *Oronæ*, and other also (Homer's *Oronæ*), but the fertility of land, country and mountains are most rich and fertile.



The Phocians were bounded on the north by the little territories called *Doris* and *Dryopis*, which separated them from the *Melians*,—on the north-east, east and south-west by the different branches of *Lokris*,—and on the south-east by the *Boeotians*. They touched the *Euboean* sea (as has been mentioned) at *Daphnia*, the point where it approaches nearest to their chief town *Elateia*; their territory also comprised most part of the lofty and bleak range of *Paros* as far as its craggy termination, where a lower portion of it, called *Kirphis*, projects into the *Corinthian* Gulf, between the two bays of *Antikyra* and *Kenna*; the latter, with its once fertile plain, was in proximity to the sacred rock of the *Delphian Apollo*. Both *Delphi* and *Kenna* originally belonged to the Phokian race. But the sanctity of the temple, together with *Lamdaemon* and, amidst the *Delphians* to set up for themselves, disavowing their connexion with the Phokian brotherhood. Territorially speaking, the most valuable part of Phokis<sup>1</sup> consisted in the valley of the river *Kephissos*, which takes its rise from *Paros* not far from the Phokian town of *Lilae*, passes between *Olis* and *Kenta* on one side and *Paros* on the other, and enters *Boeotia* near *Charonea*, discharging itself into the lake *Elgeia*. It was on the projecting mountain ledges and rocks on each side of this river that the numerous little Phokian towns were situated. Twenty-two of them were destroyed and broken up into villages by the *Amphiktyonic* order after the second Sacred War; *Alos* (one of the few, if not the only one, that was spared) being protected by the sanctity of the temple and oracle. Of these often the most important was *Elateia*, situated on the left bank of the *Kephissos*, and on the road from *Lokris* into Phokis, in the natural march of an army from *Thermopylae* into *Boeotia*. The Phokian towns<sup>2</sup> were embodied in an ancient confederacy, which

was for a short time during the prosperity of the Phokians in the beginning of the Sacred War, though not permanently (*Antike* *Phok. Epik.* c. vi. p. 25). This story is an assumption throughout of the Phokians of *Elateia* (see the notes of *Elateia* and *Phok.* p. 25). Thus *Lokris* (see the notes of *Lokris* and *Thermopylae* in *Antike* and *Antike* *Phok.* c. vi. p. 25; *Antike*, c. vi. p. 25).

<sup>1</sup> *Phokis*, c. vi. p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> *Phokis*, c. i. p. 1; *Antike* *Phok.* c. vi. p. 25; *Antike* c. vi. p. 25, with the notes of *Phokis*.

The name *Phokis* of *Paros*, though the larger part of it is devoted to *Elgeia*, tells us all that we know regarding the last important cities of Phokis. Compare the *Phokian* *Geography* of *Phokis*, vol. ii. c. vi. p. 25; and *Antike* *Phokis* in *Antike* *Phok.* c. vi. p. 25.

Two sacred mountains of the

held its periodical meetings at a temple between Dodona and Delphi.

The little territory called *Doris* and *Dryope* occupied the southern declivity of Mount Ossa, draining Phthia on <sup>part</sup>—the south and north-west from the *Stolides*, *Alonnes*, *Dryops*, and *Malians*. That which was called *Doris* in the historical times, and which reached, in the time of Herodotus, nearly as far eastward as the Malian Gulf, is said to have formed a part of what had been once called *Dryopis*; a territory which had comprised the south of Ossa as far as the Spercheion northward, and which had been inhabited by an old Hellenic tribe called *Dryopes*. The Dorians acquired their settlement in *Dryopis* by gift from Hekleides, who along with the Malians (so runs the legend) had expelled the *Dryopes*, and compelled them to find for themselves new seats at Hermion and Aegai, in the Argolis peninsula of Peloponnesus—at Styra and Karystos in Euboea—and in the island of Kythnos;<sup>1</sup> it is only in these five last-named mentioned places that history recognizes them. The *Dryopis* territory of *Doris* was distributed into four little townships—*Phidias* or *Akryphas*, *Bacca*, *Kythnos*, and *Bracon*—each of which seems to have occupied a separate valley belonging to one of the foci of the river *Kephissos*—the only narrow spaces of cultivated ground which this “small and sad” region presented.<sup>2</sup> In itself this tetropolis is so insignificant, that we shall rarely find occasion to mention it; but it acquired a distinctive consequence by being regarded as the metropolis of the great Dorian tribe in Peloponnesus, and receiving on that ground special protection from Sparta. I do not here touch upon that string of ante-historical conjectures—stated by Herodotus and illustrated by the legend as well as decorated by the fancy of G. Müller—through which the Dorians are affiliated with the patriarch of the Hellenic race—moving originally out of Phthiotis to Elisiotis,

<sup>1</sup> Pausan. *Ag. Sphæria* (17th cent. ed.) nearly the Phthian towns before they and it date in the Gulf marked the (see description of Phthia, note on *Epicharmus* in the *Epicharmus* ed., the note on *Agathos* in the *Corinthian* ed., *Herodotus*, in p. 441; *Pausan.* i. 10, 11.)

<sup>2</sup> *Herodotus*, vii. 44, 45, 46; *Strabo*

in ii.; *Plutarch*, *Ag. Sphæria*, vii. p. 170.

<sup>3</sup> G. Müller (*History of the Peloponnesus*, book i. chap. 17) has given up that old hypothesis about *Bacca* and *Karystos*, together with some others which appear to me very inadequately substantiated.

<sup>4</sup> *Herodotus*, *Ag. Sphæria*, vii. p. 170.









metropolis of Sardis, where the poet was born.<sup>1</sup> And among the citizens who are represented as coming forward to claim the daughter of the Elypeusian Kleisthenes in marriage, there appears both the Thracian Teukros<sup>2</sup> (from Kresna, a member of the Skopje family)—and the Hittite Hektor, brother of that Thuceros who is remembered as having imposed all his contemporary Greeks, and who had worked from unshaken faith the hardest strokes of Iliad; this Hektor seems to be set forth as a sort of antithesis to the delicate Samolymide of Iyteria, the most luxurious of mankind. Euripides introduces these characters into his dramatic picture of this memorable wedding.<sup>3</sup>

Between Plakia and Lokris on one side, and Attika (from which it is divided by the mountain Etharia and the Poros)<sup>4</sup> on the other, we find the important territory<sup>5</sup> Boeotia, which as we see holds autonomous cities, forming a sort of confederacy under the presidency of Thebes, the most powerful among them. First of this territory, destined during the second period of this history to play a part as conspicuous and effective, we know nothing during the first two centuries after 775 B.C. We first acquire some insight into it on account of the disputes between Thebes and Plataea about the year 590 B.C. Orchomenos, on the north-west of the lake Kopais, forms throughout the historical times one of the cities of the Boeotian league, seemingly the second after Thebes. But I have already stated that the Orchomenian legends, the Catalogue and other allusions in Homer, and the traces of vast power and importance yet visible in the historical age, attest the early political existence of Orchomenos and its neighbourhood apart from Boeotia.<sup>6</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> This town, supposed to be the Boeotia of Albania, is preserved by Stephan. Byz. *Cherson*, and alluded to by Strabo, l. 2, p. 481, and Plinius, *Alibi* Plaga, vi, and Strabo, *Alibi* Pl.

<sup>2</sup> Euripides, *cl. 425*.

<sup>3</sup> For an admirable geographical description of the whole part of Boeotia—the lake Kopais and its environs, in Pausanias's *Boeotia*, p. 410—414, with an explanatory map. The Boeotia is likewise treated comprehensively by the old Geographers for the description of the lake, and of the possibility of the natural Etharia, are there very clearly laid down: compare to the

see, the other into the neighbouring lake Kopais, which is supposed to have forty heads and one sole more or less without ordering. The lake Kopais is an enclosed basin, receiving all the water from Akris and Poros through the Etharia.

Pausanias says that it was settled that the authority of the same league derived from 1000, a statement which prevails to the tale of an island peopled of people from the Thracians in the Boeotian legend in 1000.

The Homeric Catalogue presents Kopais, on the south of the lake, as Boeotia, but not Orchomenos, nor Argos (Iliad, l. 975).



From our first view of Individual States downward, there appears a confederation which embraces the whole territory; and during the Polygonian war the <sup>Confeder-  
tion of  
North.</sup> Thibos divides "the ancient constitutional maxims of the Saxons" as a justification of extreme rigour, as well as of treacherous breach of the peace, against the recalcitrant Polygon.<sup>1</sup> Of this confederation the greater cities were primary members, while the lesser were attached to one or other of them in a kind of dependent union. Neither the names nor the number of these primary members can be certainly known: there were grounds for including Thibos, Oncomanus, Lelelele, Kerkona, Haharua, Ekepa, Antelilla, Tanagra, Thapla, and Patau before its accession.<sup>2</sup> Akrophia with the neighbouring Mount Pison and its oracle, Shilua, Ome and other places, were dependencies of Thibos: Uheremele, Aspilite, Haharua and Eytina, of Oncomanus: Ekepa, Lushira, Kerkona and Thiald, of Thapla.<sup>3</sup> Certain generals or magistrates called *Seotardas* were chosen annually to manage the common affairs of the confederation. At the time of the battle of Delium in the Polygonian war, they were eleven in number, two of them from Thibos; but whether this number was always maintained, or in what proportions the choice was made by the different cities, we find no distinct information. There were *Hierates* during the Polygonian war four different societies, with whom the *Seotardas* consulted on matters of importance; a curious arrangement, of which we have no explanation. Lastly, there was the general civil and religious festival—the *Pambroctia*—held periodically at Kerkona. Such was the force, so far as we can make them out, of the Saxon confederacy; each of the separate cities possessing its own senate and constitution, and having its political consciousness as an autonomous unit, yet with a certain habitual deference to the federal obligations. Substantially, the affairs of the confederation will be found in the hands of Thibos, managed in the interests of Thibos ascendancy, which appears to have been sustained by

<sup>1</sup> Herod. 2. 102 and others who agree. Herodotus mentions the speech of the Thibos to the Confederation after the capture of Pison, 2. 11, 12, 13.

<sup>2</sup> Herod. 2. 102. Cf. D. R. Herodotus, *Geographical and Historical*, vol. 1, 121; Herodot. 2. 102. Herodotus, *Con-*

stitution of Thapla, Herodotus, op. Cit., vol. 2, part 1, p. 121.

<sup>3</sup> Herodotus, 2. 102. Herodotus, op. Cit., vol. 2, part 1, p. 121. Herodotus, op. Cit., vol. 2, part 1, p. 121. Herodotus, op. Cit., vol. 2, part 1, p. 121. Herodotus, op. Cit., vol. 2, part 1, p. 121.

no other feeling except respect for superior force and bravery. The descendants of the minor Boeotian towns, harshly repressed and punished, form an unenviable chapter in Greek history.

One piece of information we find, respecting Thebes singly and apart from the other Boeotian towns, anterior to the year 130 B.C. Though brief and incompletely recorded, it is yet highly valuable, as one of the few incidents of solid and positive Greek history. Besides the Cretan, who was enrolled as Olympic victor in the 12th Olympiad, or 735 B.C., at a time when the oligarchy called Isodactyls possessed the government of Corinth. The beauty of his person attracted towards him the attachment of Philolaus, one of the members of the oligarchical body,—a sentiment which Greek manners did not proscribe; but it also provoked an invidious passion on the part of his own mother Heklymê, from which Besides shrunk with hatred and horror. He departed for ever his native city and retired to Thebes, whither he was followed by Philolaus, and where both of them lived and died. Their tombs were yet shown in the time of Aristotle, close adjoining to each other, yet with an opposite frontage; that of Philolaus being so placed that the inmate could command a view of the lofty peak of his native city, while that of Besides was so disposed as to block out all prospect of the hateful spot. That which presumes to be the memory of so remarkable an incident is, the esteem entertained for Philolaus by the Thebans—a feeling so pronounced, that they invited him to make laws for them. We shall have occasion to point out one or two similar cases in which Greek cities invoked the aid of an intelligent stranger; and the practice became common, among the Italian republics in the middle ages, to nominate a person not belonging to their city either as *Podestà* or as arbitrator in civil dissensions. It would have been highly interesting to know at length what laws Philolaus made for the Thebans; but Aristotle, with his usual conciseness, merely alludes to his regulations respecting the adoption of children and respecting the multiplication of offspring in each separate family. His laws were framed with the view to maintain the original number of lots of land, without either subdivision or consolidation; but by what means the purpose was to

be fulfilled we are not reformed.' There existed a law at Thibon, which perhaps may have been part of the scheme of Phylach, prohibiting exposure of children, and empowering a father under the pressure of extreme poverty to bring his new-born infant to the neighbours, who sold it for a price to any citizen-purchaser, —taking from him the obligation to bring it up, but allowing him in return to consider the child as his slave.<sup>1</sup> From these laudat efficacies, coming to us without accompanying illustration, we can draw no other inference, except that the great problem of population—the relation between the well-being of the citizens and their more or less rapid increase in numbers—had engaged the intense attention even of the earliest Grecian legislators. We may however observe that the old Cornithian legislator Phallos (whose precise date cannot be fixed) is stated by Aristotle<sup>2</sup> to have contemplated much the same objective that which is ascribed to Phylach at Thibon; an unchangeable number both of a time and of loss of land, without any attempt to alter the unequal ratio of the loss, one to the other.

<sup>1</sup> *Aristot.* *Polit.* II. 2. 3-7. How does it exactly fit the Thibon system? Thibon said: "After eight and forty days, according to the number before which I stand, I will bring my child before the citizens, and if I desire to expose it, I will give it to the slave of the citizen who will take it." Aristotle says: "The father of a child, if he is poor, may expose it, and the citizen who takes it, may sell it to the slave of the citizen who will take it." The Thibon system is, in fact, a law of exposure, which is the first principle of the Thibon system, while the first principle of the Thibon system is, in fact, a law of exposure, which is the first principle of the Thibon system.

<sup>2</sup> *Aristot.* *Polit.* II. 2. 3-7. How does it exactly fit the Thibon system? Thibon said: "After eight and forty days, according to the number before which I stand, I will bring my child before the citizens, and if I desire to expose it, I will give it to the slave of the citizen who will take it." Aristotle says: "The father of a child, if he is poor, may expose it, and the citizen who takes it, may sell it to the slave of the citizen who will take it." The Thibon system is, in fact, a law of exposure, which is the first principle of the Thibon system, while the first principle of the Thibon system is, in fact, a law of exposure, which is the first principle of the Thibon system.

<sup>3</sup> *Aristot.* *Polit.* II. 2. 3-7. How does it exactly fit the Thibon system? Thibon said: "After eight and forty days, according to the number before which I stand, I will bring my child before the citizens, and if I desire to expose it, I will give it to the slave of the citizen who will take it." Aristotle says: "The father of a child, if he is poor, may expose it, and the citizen who takes it, may sell it to the slave of the citizen who will take it." The Thibon system is, in fact, a law of exposure, which is the first principle of the Thibon system, while the first principle of the Thibon system is, in fact, a law of exposure, which is the first principle of the Thibon system.

<sup>4</sup> *Aristot.* *Polit.* II. 2. 3-7. How does it exactly fit the Thibon system?

<sup>5</sup> *Aristot.* *Polit.* II. 2. 3-7. How does it exactly fit the Thibon system? Thibon said: "After eight and forty days, according to the number before which I stand, I will bring my child before the citizens, and if I desire to expose it, I will give it to the slave of the citizen who will take it." Aristotle says: "The father of a child, if he is poor, may expose it, and the citizen who takes it, may sell it to the slave of the citizen who will take it." The Thibon system is, in fact, a law of exposure, which is the first principle of the Thibon system, while the first principle of the Thibon system is, in fact, a law of exposure, which is the first principle of the Thibon system.

## CHAPTER IV.

EARLIEST HISTORICAL VIEW OF PELOPONNESUS  
DOICAE IN ARGOS AND THE FRIGENOOKING CITIES.

We now pass from the northern members to the heart and head of Greece—Peloponnesus and Attica, taking the former first in order, and giving as much as can be ascertained respecting its early historical phenomena.

The traveller who entered Peloponnesus from Boeotia during the youthful days of Herodotus and Thucydides, found an array of powerful Doric clans continuous to each other, and beginning at the isthmus of Corinth. First came Megara, stretching across the isthmus from sea to sea, and occupying the high and rugged mountain-ridge called Cithæron: next Corinth, with its strong and conspicuous acropolis, and its territory including Mount Onkion as well as the portion of the isthmus at once most level and narrowest, which divided its two harbours called Læchæum and Randonæ. Westward of Corinth, along the Corinthian Gulf, stood Sikyon, with a plain of enormous fertility, between the two towns: southward of Sikyon and Onkion were Nauplia and Kleonæ, both continuous, as well as Corinth, with Argos and the Argolic peninsula. The narrow head of the Argolic Gulf, including a considerable space of flat and marshy ground adjoining to the sea, was possessed by Argos: the Argolic peninsula was divided by Argos with the Doric cities of Epidaureus and Troezen, and the Depopled city of Harminæ, the latter possessing the north-western corner. Proceeding southward along the western coast of the gulf, and passing over the little river called Tanon, the traveller found himself in the domain of Sparta, which comprised the

Traveller-  
view of  
Peloponnesus  
from Corinth  
and S. E.

Continuation  
Spartan  
territory.

entire southern region of the peninsula from its eastern to its western sea, where the river Neda flows into the latter. He first passed both ranges across the difficult mountain range called Parion (which bounds to the west the southern portion of Argolis), until he found himself in the valley of the river Olenos, which he followed until it joined the Euritao. In the larger valley of the Euritao, far removed from the sea, and accessible only through the most impracticable mountain roads, lay the five unwall'd, unadorn'd, adjoining villages, which bore collectively the formidable name of Sparta. The whole valley of the Euritao, from Silirota and Polioastris at the border of Arcadia, to the Laconian Gulf—expanding in several parts into fertile plains, especially near its mouth, where the towns of Orythron and Helos were found—belonged to Sparta; together with the cold and high mountain range to the eastward which projects into the promontory of Malea—and the still loftier chain of Taygetos to the westward, which ends in the promontory of Tanarus. On the other side of Taygetos, on the banks of the river Pamana, which flows down into the Messenian Gulf, lay the plain of Messini, the richest land in the peninsula. This plain had once yielded its ample produce to the free Messenian Dorians, resident in the towns of Stenyclitrea and Andania. But in the time of which we speak, the name of Messenians was borne only by a body of brave but homeless exiles, whose restoration to the land of their forefathers overpained even the exile's proverbially "negative" hope. Their land was confounded with the western portion of Laconia, which reached in a south-westerly direction down to the extreme point of Cape Akrotia, and northward as far as the river Neda.

Throughout his whole journey to the point last-mentioned from the borders of Boeotia and Megaris, the traveller would only step from one Dorian state into another. Western  
Pelopon-  
nese. But on crossing from the south to the north bank of the river Neda, at a point near to its mouth, he would find himself out of Doric land altogether: first in the territory called Trophyiae—next in that of Pisa or the Pisatid—thirdly in the more spacious and powerful state called Elis; then those comprising the main-land of Peloponnesus from the mouth of the Neda to that of the Laconia. The Trophyiae, distributed into



a number of small townships, the largest of which was Lacedæmon—and the Peloponnesians, equally destitute of any neighbouring city—had both, at the period of which we are now speaking, been conquered by their more powerful northern neighbours of Elis, who enjoyed the advantage of a spacious territory united under one government: the middle portion, called the Boïotia Elis, being for the most part fertile. The Elisians were a nation of *Æolian* immigrants into Peloponnesus, but the Peloponnesians and Triphylians had both been originally independent inhabitants of the peninsula—the latter being assumed to belong to the same race as the Mægares who had occupied the anti-Bœotian Orobæum: both too bore the supremacy of Elis with perpetual wariness and occasional resistance.

Crossing the river Læris, and pursuing the northern coast of Peloponnesus north of the Corinthian Gulf, the traveller would pass into Achæia—a name which denegated the narrow strip of level land, and the projecting spurs and declivities, between that gulf and the northernmost mountains of the peninsula—Rhodæ, Erymanthos, Arcadia, Kœfissos, and the towering eminence called Kyllênê. Achæian cities—twelve in number at least, if not more—divided this long strip of land amongst them, from the mouth of the Læris to the north-western Cape Arion on one side, to the western boundary of the Sikyonian territory on the other. According to the accounts of the earliest legends and the belief of Herodotus, this territory had been once occupied by *Ionian* inhabitants, whom the Achæians had expelled.

In making this journey, the traveller would have finished the circuit of Peloponnesus; but he would still have left unvisited the great central region, enclosed between the mountains just enumerated—approaching almost to the sea on the borders of Triphyliâ, but never touching it anywhere. This region was Arcadia, possessed by inhabitants who are uniformly represented as all of one race, and all shepherds. It was high and bleak, full of wild mountains, rocks, and forest, and descending, to a degree unusual even in Greece, with these high-backed basins from whence the water finds only a subterraneous way. It was distributed among a large number of distinct villages and cities. Many of the village tribes—the

Northern  
Peloponnesians  
proper—  
Achæians.

Central  
region—  
Arcadians.



whose possessions cover the fertile plain of Messenia along the river Pamisos to its mouth in the Messenian Gulf: it is to be noted that Messenia was then the name of the plain generally, and that no town so called existed until after the battle of Leuctra. Again, eastward of the valley of the Eurates, the mountainous region and the western shores of the Argolic Gulf down to Cape Malis are also independent of Sparta; belonging to Argos, or rather to Dorian towns in union with Argos. All the great Dorian towns, from the borders of the Hesperid to the eastern frontier of Arcadia, as above enumerated, appear to have existed in 776 B.C.: Achæia was in the same condition, so far as we are able to judge, as well as Aegiale, except in regard to its western frontier continuous with Sparta, of which more will hereafter be said. In respect to the western portion of Peloponnesus, Elis (properly so called) appears to have embraced the same territory in 776 B.C. as in 686 B.C.: but the Pandii had been recently conquered, and was yet imperfectly subjected by the Elisians; while Trophya seems to have been quite independent of them. Respecting the south-western promontory of Peloponnesus down to Cape Aklia, we are altogether without positive information: reasons will hereafter be given for believing that it did not at that time form part of the territory of Messenian Dorians.

Of the different races or people whom Herodotus knew in Peloponnesus, he believed there to be original—the Argives, the Achæans, and the Erythraians. The Achæans, though belonging indigenously to the peninsula, had yet removed from the northern portion of it to the northern, expelling the previous Ionian tenants: this is a part of the legend respecting the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus, and we can rather easily see how it came to be so. But neither the Argives nor the Erythraians had ever changed their abodes. Of the latter I have not before spoken, because they were never (so far as history knows them) an independent population. They occupied the larger portion<sup>1</sup> of the territory of Argolis, from Ormen, near the

<sup>1</sup> This is the only way of reconciling Herodotus (viii. 73, with Thucydides ii. 24, and v. 42). The original intent of the Erythraian territory is a point on

which neither of them had any means of easy access information, but there is no question as to the case in favor of the latter.





alleged sum total cannot be made to agree with the facts without great losses of conjecture. O. Müller observes,<sup>1</sup> in reference to the Alexandrian chronology, "that our materials only enable us to restore it to its original state, not to verify its correctness". In point of fact they are insufficient even for the former purpose, as the discrepancies among learned critics attest.

We have a succession of names still more barren of facts, in the case of the Dorian sovereigns of Corinth. This city had its own line of Heraklids, descended from Herakles, but not through Hyllus. Hippodotus, the propagator of the Corinthian Heraklids, was reported to have originally joined the Dorian invaders of the Peloponnese, but to have quitted them in consequence of having slain the prophet Kassandra.<sup>2</sup> The three brothers, when they became masters of the peninsula, sent for Alcibi the son of Hippodotus, and placed him in possession of Corinth, over which the chrono-

the Lacedæmonians, as Herodotus them, represented Lykurgos the Lacedæmonian and his children at Epidauri, or at Pyrgostolæ, &c.—while Alcibi is made the son of Proetus, and others make him son of Menelaus of the Pelopon. See compend. Herod. l. 40; 41, 42. Herodotus, lib. 2, 5.

Some conjectures concerning the early series of Spartan kings will be found in the G. G. Lewis's article in the Philol. Museum, vol. 2, p. 27—28. It is a review of the account of the Spartan chronologists.

Concerning the Lacedæmonian chronology of Herodotus, see G. G. p. 424—425. We learn, however, of his reigns considerably, in order to read the further epoch which he assigns to the capture of Troy and the return of the Heraklids.

<sup>1</sup> History of the Dorians, vol. 2. Appendix A. 44.

<sup>2</sup> This story—that Alcibiades' grandson of the great Corinthian Herakles had slain the lady queen Kassandra, and had been punished for it by being banished, and afterwards—brought to the conjecture, that the Corinthians did not consider the festival of the Kassandra common to the Dorian people.

Herodotus tells us, with regard to the Ionians, that all of them celebrated the festival of Agamemnon, except Hyllus and Alcibiades, and that these two cities did not celebrate it,

"because of a certain reason, already mentioned," before this story. "Other cities however celebrated it, and these were they that were united." (lib. 2, 5.)

The number of Ionians by Hippodotus was probably the same number which Herodotus the Corinthian was celebrating the Kassandra, at least this supposition gives to the legend a special pertinence which is otherwise wanting to it. Concerning the Kassandra and Kassandra see Herodotus the Pelopon. G. G. p. 42—43. Thirlwall, 240.

There were various other customs connected with the Dorian traditions, which it was usual to record for the more legendary tale. Thus an account of the time when Alcibi was banished, or expelled by the Ionians, as the Ionians power. The legend is given in the text, that Alcibiades had married and slain his daughter the two Heraklids brothers, when they were proceeding to the following games at Thebes to meet guests from the Pelopon. This legend Alcibiades was to be banished by the Ionians, and Alcibiades, brother of the same name, represented a man upon the Pelopon. It is that Alcibiades was the Ionian festival. The legend is the same story, explaining why the Ionians were so wonderful and were known to record them (Pausan. G. G. 2, 4, 1—2). See fragments 27, 28, 29, 30.



the legend of the Herakleids seems to recognize by making Theseus the eldest brother of the three. And Herodotus agrees on that of our time all the eastern coast of Peloponnesus down to Cape Nafion, including the island of Kythira, all which seems afterwards to constitute a national part of Argos, had belonged to Argos.<sup>1</sup> Down to the time of the first Messenian war, the comparative importance of the Dorian establishments in Peloponnesus appears to have been in the order in which the legend placed them,—Argos first,<sup>2</sup> Sparta second, Messeni third. It will be seen hereafter that the Argives never lost the recollection of this early pre-eminence, from which the growth of Sparta had intruded them; and the liberty of entire Hellas was more than once in danger from their dangerous jealousy of a more fortunate competitor.

At a short distance of about three miles from Argos, and at the exact point where that city approaches nearest to the sea,<sup>3</sup> was situated the isolated hill-top called Tamenion, noticed both by Strabo and Pausanias. It was a small village deriving both its name and its celebrity from the chapel and tomb of the hero Tamenon, who was there worshipped by the Dorians; and the statement which Pausanias heard was, that Tamenon with his invading Dorians had raised and fortified the spot, and employed it as an armed post to make war upon Tisamenon and the Achæans. What renders this report deserving of the greater attention is, that the same thing is affirmed with regard to the eminence called Solypuron near Corinth: this too was believed to be the place which the Dorian warriors had occupied and fortified against the pre-existing Corinthians in the city. Situated close upon the Saronic Gulf, it was the spot which invaders

Argos was  
made of  
the Dorians  
at Argos  
and Corinth  
—Argos  
—Corinth  
Solypuron.

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, l. viii. The Herakleids with Theseus, Egeides, and all landed at Argos. What other hill-top can be meant? The last mentioned is confirmed.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo, l. viii. p. 490, where he is full of the old story and the importance of the Dorians in Peloponnesus during the Herakleids.—(l. i. c. 4.)

<sup>3</sup> Pausanias, l. ii. c. 11. Herodotus, l. viii. p. 490. Pausanias also mentions Argos as the seat of war near Argos. "The

emine is thoroughly hot and for the most part sandy; only at the edge, which where Argos is situated, is the most fertile. Through the middle of it is a stream, at the source of which are the Dorians and Argives, and the office of the Argives, to preserve with words and traditions, — stands as a witness of some invasion and conquest of Argos made, upon which the Argives themselves were placed." (Strabo in Pausanias, vol. i. book i. p. 142 Smith, 1841.)



landing from that gulf would naturally come upon, and which Nikias with his powerful Athenian fleet did actually seize and occupy against Corinth in the Peloponnesian war.<sup>1</sup> In early days the only way of overpassing the inhabitants of a fortified town, generally also placed in a position itself very defensible, was—that the invaders, encamping themselves in the neighbourhood, harassed the inhabitants and ruined their produce until they brought them to terms. Even during the Peloponnesian war, when the art of besieging had made some progress, we read of several instances in which this mode of aggressive warfare was adopted with efficient results.<sup>2</sup> We may readily believe that the Dorians obtained admittance both into Argos and Corinth in this manner. And it is remarkable that, except Sikyón (which is affirmed to have been surprised by night), there were the only towns in the Argolic region which are said to have resisted them; the story being, that Pílos, Epidauria, and Troezen had admitted the Dorian intruders without opposition, although a certain portion of the previous inhabitants remained. We shall hereafter see that the non-Dorian population of Sikyón and Corinth still remained considerable.

The separate statements which we then find, and the position of the Tamarion and the Solygeia, lead to two conjectures—first, that the acquisitions of the Dorians in Peloponnesus were also limited and gradual, not at all conformable to the rapid strides of the old Herakleid legend; next, that the Dorian invaders of Argos and Corinth made their attack from the Argolic and the Saronic Gulfs—by sea and not by land. It is indeed difficult to see how they can have got to Tamarion in any other way than by sea; and a glance at the map will show that the extensive Solygeia presents itself<sup>3</sup> with reference to Corinth, as the nearest and most convenient holding-ground for a maritime invader, conformably to the scheme of operations laid by Nikias. To illustrate the supposition of a Dorian attack by sea on Corinth, we may refer to a story quoted from Anaxilas (which we find embodied in the explanation of an old adage) representing Hippodám the father of Alcibiades as having

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. iv. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Thucyd. i. 101; ii. 26; vi. 34–37; viii. 56–58.

<sup>3</sup> Thucyd. iv. 23.

around the Helles Gulf<sup>1</sup> (the sea immediately bordering on the coast of Mysia, Dryopis and Doris) in ships for the purpose of colonizing. And if it be safe to trust the mention of Doris in the Odyssey, as a part of the population of the island of Kikis, we there have an example of Dorian settlements which must have been effected by sea, and that too at a very early period. "We must suppose (observes O. Müller,<sup>2</sup> in reference to these Ereian Dorians) that the Dorians, pressed by want or violence from inland, constructed

*These  
Dorians  
were  
Ereian.*

piratical crews, manned their frail and narrow barks with soldiers who themselves worked at the oar, and thus being changed from mountaineers into seamen—the Warriors of Greece—set sail for the distant island of Kikis." In the same manner we may conceive the expeditions of the Dorians against Argos and Corinth to have been effected: and whatever difficulties may attach to this hypothesis, certain it is that the difficulties of a long land march, along such a territory as Greece, are still more serious.

The supposition of Dorian emigrations by sea, from the Helles Gulf to the north-eastern promontory of Peloponnesus, is further borne out by the analogy of the Dryopes or Dryopis. During the historical times, this people occupied several detached settlements in various parts of Greece, all maritime and some inland:—they were found at Hermioné, Argos, and Kala, in the Argolic peninsula (very near by the important Dorian towns constituting the Amphictyony of Argos<sup>3</sup>); at Styra and Eurytos in the island of Euboea—in the island of Kythira, and even at Cyprus. These dispersed colonies can only have been planted by expeditions over the sea. Now we are told that the original Dryopis, the native country of this people, comprehended both the territory near the river Spercheios,

*The Dryopis—dry settlements formed by sea.*

<sup>1</sup> Called by Ptolemy, in a, the Ionic strait—the *Strait of Helles*, a, b.

<sup>2</sup> Hist. of Dorians, ch. i. c. *Dorians positively affirm that the Dorians came from Peloponnesus to Kikis*; but this affirmation does not seem to me to contradict any additional evidence of the fact: it is a supposition advanced in the Odyssey (ch. vii.) as the migration of Achæans and Peloponnesians entirely done.

*Antiquities of Greece*, vol. p. 419.

It appears to have believed that the Dorians entered in Argos out of the gulf Peloponnesus (ch. viii.) according to the ancient legend, they had obtained shelter when persecuted by Peloponnesians, accompanying a body of Peloponnesians who were settled at Mycenæ. The names therefore have denoted the Dorian occupation of Argos with the exception of the Peloponnesians.

<sup>3</sup> *Herod.* viii. 43–45. *Strabo* in 12; *Plutarch* in 14, 4.

and north of Elis, afterwards occupied by the Molians, as well as the neighbouring district south of Elis, which was afterwards called Ithia. From hence the Dryopians were expelled—according to one story, by the Dorians—according to another, by Herakles and the Molians; however this may be, it was from the Molian Gulf that they started on shipboard in quest of new homes, which some of them found on the headlands of the Argolic peninsula.<sup>1</sup> And it was from this very country, according to Herodotus,<sup>2</sup> that the Dorians also set forth, in order to reach Peloponnesus. How does it even unreasonable to imagine, that the same means of conveyance, which bore the Dryopians from the Molian Gulf to Herakles and Ithia, also carried the Dorians from the same place to the Isthmus and the hill Sicyonia.

The legend represents Sikyia, Epidauria, Troika, Philia, and Kleona, as all occupied by Dorians colonists from Argos, under the different sons of Timonon: the first three are on the sea, and fit places for the occupation of maritime invaders. Argos and the Doron towns in and near the Argolic peninsula are to be regarded as a cluster of settlements by themselves, completely distinct from Sparta and the Messenian Streptilia, which appear to have been formed under totally different conditions. First, both of them are very far inland—Streptilia not easy, Sparta very difficult, of access from the sea; next, we know that the conquests of Sparta were gradually made *down* the valley of the Eurotas seaward. Both these acquisitions present the appearance of having been made from the land-side, and perhaps in the direction which the Herakleian legend describes—by warriors entering Peloponnesus across the narrow mouth of the Corinthian Gulf through the old or Isthmian of those Kleonæ settlers who at the same time colonized Elis. The early and intimate connection (as which I shall touch presently) between Sparta and the Olympic games as administered by the Kleonæ, as well as the leading part ascribed to Lykurgos in the

<sup>1</sup> Herodot. vii. p. 372. ix. p. 474. Herodot. vii. 23. Pausanias, vi. 25 and 26, and Olynth. Epist. 13. 2. Diodor. Siculus, xiv. 1. 2. Strabo, vi. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

<sup>2</sup> Herodot. i. 14. Strabo, vi. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.



Pythia, in whose name the obligations incumbent on the members of the league were imposed. While in each of the confederated cities there was a temple to this god, his most holy and central sanctuary was on the Larion or acropolis of Argos. At this central Argive sanctuary solemn sacrifices were offered by Epidaure as well as by other members of the confederacy, and, as it should seem, accompanied by money payments<sup>1</sup>—which the Argives, as chief administrators on behalf of the common god, took upon them to enforce against Sicyonians, and actually tried to enforce during the Peloponnesian war against Epidaure. On another occasion, during the 66th Olympiad (A.C. 514), they imposed the large fine of 500 talents upon each of the two states Sikyon and Argos, for having lost ships to the Spartan king Kleomenes whenever he invaded the Argive territory. The Argives set the claim at defiance, but the Sikyonians acknowledged its justice, and only demanded its amount, protesting themselves ready to pay 100 talents.<sup>2</sup> There can be no doubt that at this later period the ascendancy of Argos over the members of her primitive confederacy had become practically inoperative; but the tenor of the cases mentioned shows that her claims were revivals of Argive privileges, which had once been effective and valuable.

How valuable the privileges of Argos were, before the great rise of the Spartan power,—how important an ascendancy they conferred in the hands of an energetic man, and how easily they started of being used in furtherance of ambitious views, is shown by the remarkable case of Perikles the Tarentine. The few facts which we learn respecting this prince exhibit to us, for the first time, something like a real position of parties in the Peloponnesus, wherein the actual conflict of living, historical men and cities comes out in tolerable distinctness.

Perikles was designated by Ephorus as the tenth, and by

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus probably meant that of the Delphic sanctuary, see *ibid.* See *Argos*, by O. Ross, Berlin, p. 2—23.

<sup>2</sup> *Thucyd.* v. 25. *Strabo* xviii. 244 says that Argos was the seat of Perikles, which the historian does in regard to the state of Argos against Epidaure, seems to imply a correspondence with the other

represented by Athens, from Epidaure (*ibid.* v. 25).

<sup>3</sup> *Thucydides* and *Isidore* separately mention the Argives, and Argos with the assistance of Epidaure, was swept upon by the Argive prince Tarentine (*ibid.* v. 25, 26).

<sup>4</sup> *Herod.* vi. 52. See C. *NOTES*, History of the Peloponnesus, ch. 7, 21.





one example in which blood was shed, to determine what state should enjoy it. Peisistratus marched to Olympia, at the epoch of the 5th recorded Olympiad, or 747 B.C.; on the occasion of which event we are made acquainted with the real state of parties in the peninsula.

The plain of Olympia—now swathed only by imperial vegetation, but once crowded with all the decorations of religion and art, and forming for many centuries the brightest centre of attraction known in the ancient world—was situated on the river Alpheus in the territory called the *Panist*,<sup>1</sup> bounded by the borders of Arcadia. At what time its agonists festined, recurring every fourth year at the first full moon after the summer solstice, first began or first acquired its character of special sanctity, we have no means of determining. As with so many of the ancient writers of Greece—we follow the stream upward to a certain point, but the fountain-head and the earlier flow of history are buried under mountains of unsearchable legend. The first celebration of the Olympic contests was marked by Grecian legendary faith to Herakles—and the site of the place, in the middle of the *Panist* with its eight small townships, is quite sufficient to prove that the inhabitants of that little territory were warranted in describing themselves as the original administrators of the ceremony.<sup>2</sup> But the state of things seems to have been altered by the Median settlement in Asia, which is represented as having been conducted by Oxyles and identified with the return of the Herakleids. The *Stroto-Etolans*, bordering upon the *Panist* to the north, employed their superior power in subduing their weaker neighbours,<sup>3</sup> who thus lost their autonomy and became annexed to the territory of Asia. It was the general rule throughout Greece, that a victorious state undertook to perform<sup>4</sup> the current services of the conquered people towards the gods—such services being conceived as attaching to the soil. Hence the celebration of the Olympic games became transferred among the inhabitants of Asia, just in the same way as the worship of the Eleusinian Demeter, when Eleusis lost its autonomy, was included among the religious obligations of Athens. The *Panistans* however were

Exaltation of  
Pana, with  
Pana, and  
Pana, was  
the.

<sup>1</sup> Joseph, *Relig.* vii. 4, 10; *Diogen.*  
ap. 75.

<sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, vii. p. 264.  
<sup>3</sup> *Joseph.* *ib.* 10.



willingly acquiesced in this assumption of what had once been their separate privilege. They long maintained their conviction that the celebration of the games was their right, and strove on several occasions to regain it. Of these occasions the earliest, so

far as we know, was connected with the intervention of Phœdus. It was at their invitation that the king of Argos went to Olympia, and celebrated the games himself, in competition with the Pontians, as the literal meaning of Hierocles; while the Eleans, being thus heavily disappointed, refused to include the 218 Olympiad in their register of the victorious names. But their hesitation did not last long, for the Spartans took their part, and the contest ended in the defeat of Phœdus. In the next Olympiad, the Elean management and the regular establishment appear as before. The Spartans are even said to have conferred life on her possession both of Phœdis and Triphleia.<sup>1</sup>

Unfortunately these scanty particulars are all which we learn regarding the armed conflict at the 218 Olympiad, in which the religious and the political grounds of quarrel are so intimately blended—as we shall find to be often the case in Greek history. But there is one act of Phœdus yet more memorable, of which also nothing beyond a single notice has come down to us. He first coined both copper and silver money at Sigea, and first established a scale of weights and measures,<sup>2</sup> which, through Elean influence, became adopted throughout Peloponnesia, and acquired ultimately footing both in all the Doric states, and in Boeotia, Thessaly, northern Bœotia generally, and Macedonia—under the name of the Sigean scale. There was, subsequently, another rival scale in Greece, called the Elean, differing considerably from the Sigean. We do not know at what time the Elean came in, but it was employed both at Athens and in the Ionic states generally, as well as in Eubœa—being modified at Athens, so far as money was concerned, by Solon's debasement of the coinage.

<sup>1</sup> Pausan. v. 11. § 1; Herodot. viii. p. 264. <sup>2</sup> Herodot. vi. 127. The scale of the ruler (the ruler the Hierocles), however, belonging to the 218 Olympic

and, appears only in the text. It was, however, applied after the text.

<sup>3</sup> Herodot. vi. 127, before the text. viii. p. 264—265.

The copious and valuable information contained in M. Bouché's recent publication on Metrology has thrown new light upon these monetary and metrological subjects.<sup>1</sup> He has shown that both the *Agæan* and the *Phœnician* scales—the former standing to the latter in the proportion

*Agæan*  
of the *Agæan*  
scale stands  
to the  
*Phœnician*.

of 8 : 5—had contemporaneous currency in different parts of the *Pæonian* empire; the divisions and denominations of the scale being the same in both, 100 drachmæ = 1 mina, and 60 minæ to a talent. The *Babylonian* talent, mina, and drachmæ are identical with the *Agæan*, the word mina = of *Assyria* origin; and it has now been rendered highly probable, that the scale circulated by *Phœnicians* was borrowed immediately from the *Phœnicians*, and by them originally from the *Babylonians*. The *Babylonian*, *Hebraic*, *Phœnician*, *Egyptian*, and *Grecian* scales of weight (which were subsequently followed wherever coined money was introduced) are found to be so nearly conformable, as to warrant a belief that they are all deduced from one common origin; and that origin the *Chaldean* priesthood of *Babylon*. It is to *Phœnicians*, and to his position as chief of the *Assyrian* confederacy, that the *Greeks* owe the first introduction of the *Babylonian* scale of weight, and the first employment of coined and stamped money.

If we mutually weigh the two last striking coins of *Phœnicians* which have been preserved to us, and which there is no reason to disavow, we shall find ourselves introduced to an early historical age of *Peloponnesus* very different from that in which another century will bring us. That *Agæa*, with the federative union attached to her, was at this early time decidedly the commanding power in that peninsula, is sufficiently shown by the establishment and reception of the *Phœnician* weights, measures, and monetary system—while the other incidents mentioned completely

Agæan  
of the  
Agæan  
scale  
stands  
to the  
Phœnician  
scale.

<sup>1</sup> *Metrologische Untersuchungen über die Gewichte, Maasse, und Münzen der Alterthümer in Gross-Britannien*, herausg. von August Hirschfeld, von Aug. Hirschfeld, Berlin, 1836.

<sup>2</sup> *Antiqu. v. 1*.—M. Bouché remarks with all reason in stating that *Phœnicians* in introducing the *Chaldean* system, deduced from the *Assyrian* system, and probably adopted the measures of the *Assyrians*, or that he is at all misled here.

scale of weight. In general, I do not think that M. Bouché's conclusions are well made out, in regard to the *Assyrian* measures of weight and capacity. In an examination of these measures, I arrived at results dissimilar to the *Chaldean* system. (*Ann. vol. 1*) I am indebted to Mr. Smith, with the view of preparing papers published by the Society, and for conversations in which he appeared to me to have failed.

harmonies with the same idea. Against the aggression of Min, the Plataeans invoked Pheidon—partly as exercising a primacy in Peloponnesus, just as the inhabitants of Lepreum in Trophyia,<sup>1</sup> three centuries afterwards, called in the aid of Sparta for the same object, at a time when Sparta possessed the leadership—and partly as the legal representative of Minikids, who had expelled these games from the management of which they had been unjustly excluded. On the other hand, Sparta appears as a second-rate power. The Spartan scale of weight and measure was adopted there as elsewhere<sup>2</sup>—the Messenian Dorians were still equal and independent—and we find Sparta interfering to assist Min by virtue of an obligation growing (so the legend represents it) out of the common Minio-Dorian migration: not at all from any acknowledged primacy, such as we shall see her enjoying hereafter. The first coining of copper and silver money is a capital event in Greek history, and must be held to imply considerable commerce as well as those extensive slaves which belong only to a conspicuous and leading position. The ambition of Pheidon to remove all the acquisitions made by his ancestor Minikids, supports the same large estimate of his actual power. He is characterized as a despot, and even as the most insolent of all despots;<sup>3</sup> how far he deserved such a reputation, we have no means of judging. We may remark, however, that he lived before the age of despots or tyrants, properly so called, and before the Household lineage had yet lost its primary, half-political, half-religious character. Moreover, the later historians have treated his actions with a colour of archaic aggression, by applying them to a state of things which belonged to their time, and not to his. Thus Ephorus represents him as having deprived the Laconians of the leadership of Peloponnesus, which they never possessed until long after him—and also as seizing at night the seven inviolability of the territory of the Minians, enjoyed by the latter as colonists of the Olympic games;

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. i. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Pheidon, *Agrothegon*, *Scythia*, p. 107, *Memorialis ap. Aelian.*, in p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> The *Agamem* also, *disfines* and *spoli* with the *Minikids* *supplanted* in *aggression* among the *Minikids* *minors* (*Thucyd.* i. 10).

<sup>4</sup> *Herodot.* i. 107. *Agamem*, *disfines* *spoli* *Minikids* *supplanted* in *aggression* among the *Minikids* *minors* (*Thucyd.* i. 10).

*Agamem* also *disfines* *spoli* *Minikids* *supplanted* in *aggression* among the *Minikids* *minors* (*Thucyd.* i. 10).

whereas the Agonothetes, or right of superintendence claimed by him, had not at that time acquired the sanction of prescription—while the conquest of Pisa by the Eleans themselves had proved that the sacred function did not protect the territory of a weaker people.

How Pisa fell, and how the Argives lost that supremacy which they once evidently possessed, we have no positive details to inform us: with respect to the latter points, however, we can discern a sufficient explanation. The Argives stood predominant as an entire and unanimous confederacy, which required a vigorous and able hand to render its internal organisation effective or its ascendancy respected without. No such leader afterwards appeared at Argos, the whole history of which city is destitute of eminent individuals: her line of kings continued at least down to the Persian war,<sup>2</sup> but seemingly with only titular functions, for the government had long been factually popular. The statements which represent the government as popular antedate to the time of Pisistratus, appear erroneously of time. That prince is rather to be taken as violating the old, undisturbed prerogatives of the Herakleid kings, but violating them with unusual effect—enforcing relaxed privileges, and appealing to the old heroic sentiment in reference to Herakles, rather than revolutionising the existing relations either of Argos or of Peloponnesos. It was in fact the great and steady growth of Sparta, for three centuries after the Lykurgian institutions, which operated as a cause of subversion to the portions of Argos and Peloponnesos in Greece.

The assertion made by Herodotus—that in earlier times the whole eastern coast of Laconia, as far as Cape Malea, including the island of Kythira and several other islands, had belonged to Argos—is referred by O. Müller to about the 50th Olympiad, or 560 B.C. Perhaps it had ceased to be true at that period; but that it was true, in the age of Pisistratus, there seem good grounds for believing. What is probably meant is, that the Dorians were on this coast, Frisios, Sakhos, Epidaurios Limnos, and Sines, were once satrapies, and members of the Argive

The  
conquest  
declined,  
from the  
extension  
of the  
confederacy  
of states.

Dorians to  
the Argives,  
probably—  
their early  
connection  
with the  
Dorian  
tribes to  
the Argives.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, vii. 235.

confederacy—a fact highly probable, on independent evidence, with respect to Epidaurea. Lindos, however, as that town was a settlement from Epidaurea in the Argolic peninsula: and Boon too had its own chief and eparchy, the Herakleid Dana,<sup>1</sup> now connected with Sparta—perhaps derived from the same source as the name of the town Boon in Doria. The Argolic confederated towns would thus comprehend the whole coast of the Argolic and Saronic gulfs, from Erythrae as far as Argos, besides other islands which we do not know. Argos had received a colony of Dorians from Argos and Epidaurea, upon which latter town it continued for some time in a state of dependence.<sup>2</sup> It will at once be seen that this extent of coast implies a considerable degree of commerce and maritime activity. We have besides to consider the range of Doric colonies in the southern islands of the Aegean and in the south-western corner of Asia Minor—Krota, Khe, Rhodus (with its three distinct cities), Nixthamassia, Knidos, Myndia, Nisyros, Synd, Karpathos, Kalypso, &c. Of the Doric establishments here named, several are connected (as has been before stated) with the great migration of the Thersand Athenians from Argos: but what we particularly observe is, that they are often selected as colonies prominently to Argos, Troas, Epidaurea—more frequently however, as it seems, to Argos. All these settlements are doubtless older than Phœstia, and we may conceive them as proceeding conjointly from the allied Dorian towns in the Argolic peninsula, at a time when they were more in the habit of united action than they afterwards became: a captain of emigrants selected from the line of Herakleia and Thersand was suitable to the feelings of all of them. We may thus look back to a period, at the very beginning of the

<sup>1</sup> Pausan. II. 12, § 1; III. 10, § 1.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo, p. 497; Pausan. III. 1, § 1.

<sup>3</sup> Herakleia, Khe, Knidos, and Nixthamassia are all founded by Herakleia (p. 497); as colonies of Argos: Rhodus is so described by Polystratos (p. 497), and Khe by Pausanias (II. 12, § 1). Kalypso, and Myndia are described by Strabo as colonies of Epidaurea (p. 497). Nixthamassia places themselves as a colony of Troas, a colony of Troas, and Argos probably.—Thus Herakleia is connected to Argos as Troas

colony of Argos, as has before been mentioned. Herakleia, Khe, and Nixthamassia (Strabo, p. 497); Khe, Pausan. II. 12, § 1; Strabo, p. 497; Pausan. II. 12, § 1; Strabo, p. 497; Pausan. II. 12, § 1.

Herakleia (Strabo, p. 497); Khe, Pausan. II. 12, § 1; Strabo, p. 497; Pausan. II. 12, § 1; Strabo, p. 497; Pausan. II. 12, § 1.

The little town of Boon had its independence of the confederacy in Krota (Pausan. II. 12, § 1).

Olympia, when the maritime Dorians on the east of Peloponnesus maintained a considerable intercourse and commerce not only among themselves, but also with their settlements on the Asiatic coast and islands. That the Argolic peninsula formed an early centre for maritime ventures, we may further infer from the very ancient Amphiktyony of the seven cities (Hermion, Epidaure, Argos, Athens, Præstia, Nauplia, and the Megarian Onchestus), on the holy island of Kalauria, off the harbour of Troezen.<sup>1</sup>

The view here given of the early ascendancy of Argos, as the head of the Peloponnesian Dorians and the metropolis of the Asiatic Dorians, enables us to understand the capital invention of Pheidon—the first coinage, and the first determinate scale of weight and measure known in Greece. Of the value of such improvements, in the history of Grecian civilization, it is superfluous to speak, especially when we recollect that the Hellenic states, having no political unity, were only held together by the aggregate of spontaneous uniformities, in language, religion, sympathies, recreations, and general habits. We see both how Pheidon came to contract the wish, and how he acquired the power, to introduce throughout so much of the Grecian world a uniform scale. We also see that the Asiatic Dorians form the link between him and Pheidon, from whence the scale was derived, just as the Eubœan scale came, in all probability, through the Ionic cities in Asia, from Lydia. It is asserted by Ephorus, and admitted even by the ablest modern critics, that Pheidon first coined money “in Argos”;<sup>2</sup> other authors (unconsciously believing that his scale was the Eubœan scale) alleged that his coinage had been coined on “in a place of Argos called Trifene.”<sup>3</sup> Now both these statements appear highly improbable, and both are incredible to the mere mistake—of supposing that the title by which the scale had come to be commonly known, must necessarily be derived from the place in which the coinage had been struck. There is every reason to conclude, that what Pheidon did was done in Argos, and nowhere else: his coinage and scale were the earliest known in Greece, and were

From traces  
found in the  
coinage of  
Argos, &c.,  
by Pheidon.

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, p. 70.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo, op. Troezen, vii. p. 576:  
Diod. Sic. xiv. 102: see

also the Mænes Pædon, Epich. 26.  
<sup>3</sup> Strabo, op. Argos, vii. p. 576:  
Diod. Sic. xiv. 102: see

to have been known by his own name, "the Phœnician measures," under which designation they were described by Aristotle in his account of the constitution of Argos.<sup>1</sup> They probably did not come to bear the specific epithet of *Ægean*, until there was another scale in vogue, the *Euboic*, from which to distinguish them; and both the epithets were probably derived, not from the place where the scale first originated, but from the people whose commercial activity tended to make them more generally known—in the one case, the Ægeians; in the other case the inhabitants of Chalkis and Eubœa. I think, therefore, that we are to look upon the Phœnician measures as originating from Argos, and as having no greater connection, originally, with Ægean, than with any other city dependent upon Argos.

There is moreover another point which deserves notice. What was known by the name of the *Ægean* scale, as contrasted with and standing in a definite ratio (2:3) with the *Euboic* scale, related only to weight and money, so far as our knowledge extends; we have no evidence to show that the same ratio extended either to measures of length or measures of capacity. Yet there seems ground for believing that the Phœnician regulations, when in their full completeness, embraced measures of capacity as well as weights: Phœnicians, at the same time when he determined the talent, mina, and drachma, seem also to have fixed the dry and liquid measures—the medimnos and metretres, with their parts and multiples: and there existed<sup>2</sup> Phœnician measures of capacity, though not of length, so far as we know. The *Ægean* scale may thus have comprised only a portion of what was established by Phœnicians, namely that which related to weight and money.

<sup>1</sup> *Polity*, *Constitution*, c. 2, § 2. *See* also *Polity* in *Republic*, *Constitution*, *and* *the* *Phœnician* *measures* *described*, *by* *the* *Phœnicians*, *and* *the* *Ægean* *measures*, *described* *by* *the* *Ægeians*.

<sup>2</sup> *See* *Ægean* *measures*, *described*, *by* *the* *Ægeians*, *and* *the* *Phœnician* *measures*, *described* *by* *the* *Phœnicians*.

*measures* *and* *measures*, *and* *measures*, *described* *by* *the* *Phœnicians*, *and* *the* *Ægean* *measures*, *described* *by* *the* *Ægeians*.

<sup>3</sup> *See* *Ægean* *measures*, *described* *by* *the* *Ægeians*, *and* *the* *Phœnician* *measures*, *described* *by* *the* *Phœnicians*.

<sup>4</sup> *See* *Ægean* *measures*, *described* *by* *the* *Ægeians*, *and* *the* *Phœnician* *measures*, *described* *by* *the* *Phœnicians*.

## CHAPTER V.

ÆTOLIO-DORIAN IMMIGRATION INTO PELOPONNESOS—  
ELIS, LACONIA, AND MEGARIS.

It has already been stated that the territory properly called Elis, apart from the enlargement which it acquired by conquest, included the westernmost land in Peloponnesos, south of Achæia, and west of Mount Pholoi and Ocyra in Arcadia—but not extending so far southward as the river Alphæus, the course of which lay along the southern portion of Pisania and on the borders of Triphylia. This territory, which appears in the *Odyssey* as "the divine Elis, where the Epeians hold sway,"<sup>1</sup> is in the historical times occupied by a population of *Ætolian* origin. The connexion of name between the historical Elisians and the historical *Ætolians* was recognised by both parties, nor is there any ground for disputing it.<sup>2</sup>

That *Ætolian* invaders or immigrants into Elis would come from Naupactus or some neighbouring point in the Corinthian Gulf, is in the natural course of things—  
Ætolian  
invaders  
came from  
Naupactus.  
 and such is the source which Ogyges, the ancestor of the invasion, is represented by the Herakleïd legend as taking. That legend (as has been already repeatedly introduced) Ogyges as the guide of the three Herakleïd brothers—Timonæ, Kleophantos, and Aristokleus—and as stipulating with them that in the new distribution about to take place of Peloponnesos, he shall be allowed to possess the Elisian territory, supplied with many holy privileges as to the celebration of the Olympic games.

In the preceding chapter, I have endeavoured to show that the settlements of the Dorians in and near the Argolic peninsula, as

<sup>1</sup> *Odyssey* vii. 287.<sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, ii. p. 474.



far as the probabilities of the case enable us to judge, were not accomplished by any inland in this direction. But the localities occupied by the Dorians of Sparta, and by the Dorians of Messydlia in the territory called Mantak, lead us to a different conclusion. The easiest and most natural road through which immigrants could reach either of these two spots, is through the Ekeia and Piontal country. Colonel Leake observes<sup>1</sup> that the direct road from the Ekeia territory to Sparta, ascending the valley of the Alphaion near Olympia to the source of its branch, the Tethos, and from thence descending the Eorfas, affords the only easy march towards that very inaccessible city: and both ancient and moderns have remarked the vicinity of the source of the Alphaion to that of the Eorfas. The situation of Messydlia and Arkadia, the original settlements of the Mæonian Dorians, adjoining closely the Arcadian Tychææ, is only at a short distance

from the source of the Alphaion; being there reached most easily by the same route. Dismissing the idea of a great collective Dorian armament, powerful enough to grasp at once the entire peninsula,—we may imagine two moderate detachments of hardy mountaineers from the wild regions in and near Ilion, attacking themselves to the Ælians their neighbours, who were proceeding to the invasion of Eke. After having aided the Ælians both to occupy Eke and to subdue the Piontal, these Dorians advanced up the valley of the Alphaion in quest of settlements for themselves. One of these bodies ripens into the sturdy, stubborn, and victorious Spartans; the other into the short-lived, trampled, and struggling Mæonians.

Amidst the darkness which envelopes these original settlements, we seem to discern something like special causes to characterize both of them. With respect to the Spartan Dorians, we are told that a power, named Polycrates betrayed Sparta to them, persuading the sovereign in possession to retire with his people into the kalonotons of the Ioniæ in the north of the peninsula—and that he received as a recompense for this

<sup>1</sup> Leake, *North to Myra*, vol. II. p. 30. Compare *Travels* of Mr. Leake, *The Eastern Archipelago*, &c.

is marked on a pillar which Pausanias saw at Olympia, *Travels* vol. II. column II. English edit. *Myra*, p. 14, 15.



If the Spartans had become at once possessed of all Laconia, and the Messenians of all Messenia; Pausanias, too, speaks as if the Arcadians collectively had assisted and allied themselves with Kneiphontes. This is the general spirit which pervades his account, though the particular facts, in so far as we find any such, do not always harmonize with it. Now we are ignorant of the pre-existing divisions of the country either east or west of Mount Taygetus, at the time when the Dorians invaded it. But to treat the one and the other as integral kingdoms, handed over at once to two Dorian leaders, is an illusion borrowed from the old legend, from the historicizing fancies of Ephorus, and from the fact that in the well-known times this whole territory came to be really united under the Spartan power.

At what date the Dorian settlements at Sparta and Stenyl's Heron were effected we have no means of determining. Yet that there existed between them in the earliest times a degree of fraternity which did not prevail between Lacedæmon and Argos, we may fairly presume from the common temple, with joint religious sacrifices, of Artemis Lacedæa (or Artemis on the Marsh) seated <sup>thus the</sup> on the confines of Messenia and Laconia.<sup>1</sup> Our first <sup>historic</sup> glimpse of the two, at all approaching to distinctness, <sup>appears</sup> seems to date from a period about half a century earlier than the first Olympiad (776 a.c.),—about the reign of king Thibides of the Eurythætidæ or Agriæ, and the introduction of the Lycurgean discipline. Thibides stands in the list as the eighth king dating from Eurythædis. But how many of the seven kings before him are to be considered as real persons—or how much, out of the brief warlike expeditions ascribed to them, is to be treated as authentic history—I pretend not to define.

The earliest determinable event in the internal history of Sparta is the introduction of the Lycurgean discipline; the earliest external events are the conquest of Amyclæ, Theria, and Gerontion, effected by king Thibides, and the first quarrel with the Messenians, in which that prince was slain. When we come to see how deplorably great was the confusion and ignorance which reigned with reference to a matter so pre-eminently important as Lycurgus and his legislation, we shall not be inclined to think

<sup>1</sup> Pausan. l. ii. §. 2. *sanctioris et divitiæ pæne Argolis et in Messeniæ et Lacedæmonia.*

that their much less important and belonging to an earlier epoch, can have been handed down upon any good authority. And in like manner when we learn that Amyclia, Pharis, and Gauronura (all north of Sparta, and the first only two and a half miles distant from that city) were independent of the Spartans until the reign of Tléklidas, we shall require some decisive testimony before we can believe that a community, so small and so hemmed in as Sparta must then have been, had in earlier times successful expeditions against Helos on the sea-coast, against Klodis on the extreme northern side of Arcadia, against the Erymanians, or against the Argives. If Helos and Erymania were conquered by these early kings, it appears that they had to be conquered a second time by kings succeeding Tléklidas. It would be more natural that we should hear when and how they conquered the places nearest to them,—Sikania, or Polakina, the valley of the Olenos or the upper valley of the Eurotas. But these seem to be assumed as matters of course; the proceedings ascribed to the early Spartan kings are such only as might become the policy days when Sparta was undisputed mistress of all Laconia.

The succession of Messenian kings, beginning with Kresphontes, the Herakleid brother, and continuing from father to grandson, —*Ephyra, Chloros, Istakinos, Dotadas, Salutas,* Messenian Kings.  
*Prinos*, the last being contemporary with Tléklidas,—is still less marked by incident than that of the early Spartan kings. It is said that the reign of Kresphontes was troubled, and himself ultimately slain, by mutinies among his subjects; *Ephyra*, then a youth, having escaped into Arcadia, was afterwards restored to the throne by the Arcadians, Spartans, and Argives.<sup>1</sup> From *Ephyra* the Messenian line of kings are stated to have been descended *Ephyra* in preference to Herakleides—which affords another proof of their intimate connection with the Arcadians, since *Ephyra* was a very ancient name in Arcadian heroic antiquity.<sup>2</sup>

There is considerable resemblance between the alleged behaviour of Kresphontes on first settling at Stenykliron, and that of Eury-

<sup>1</sup> Pausan. *loc. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, *lib. ii. 104.*

*Messenian royal register.*

1877 *Ann. Realist.*, 1877 *Realist.* *Ann.*

1877, *Ann. Realist.*, 1877 *Realist.* *Ann.*







we may see that the Lacedæmonians regarded the Olympic games as a portion of their own antiquities. Moreover, it is certain both that the dignity of the festival increased simultaneously with their ascendancy,<sup>1</sup> and that their peculiar habits were very early introduced into the practice of the Olympic competitions. Probably the three kinds of re-springing invaders, Ætolians and Spartans and Messenians. Dorians, may have adopted this festival as a periodical recreation of mutual union and fraternity; from which cause the games became an attractive centre for the western portion of Peloponnesians, before they were much frequented by people from the eastern, or still more from extra-Peloponnesian, Hellenæ. For it cannot be altogether accidental, when we read the names of the first twelve proclaimed Olympic victors (occupying nearly half a century from 776 a.c. downwards), to find that seven of them are Messenians, three Ætolians, one from Dyris or Achæa, and one from Korinth; while after the twelfth Olympiad, Corinthians, and Megarians and Epilæurians begin to occur; later still, extra-Peloponnesian victors. We may reasonably infer from hence that the Olympic ceremonies were at this early period chiefly frequented by visitors and competitors from the western regions of Peloponnesus, and that the attention to them from the more distant parts of the Hellenic world did not become considerable until the first Messenian war had closed.

Having thus set forth the conjectures, to which our very scanty knowledge points, respecting the first establishment of the Ætolian and Dorian settlements in Elis, Laconia, and Messenia, connected as they are with the steadily-increasing dignity and frequentation of the Olympic festival, I proceed in the next chapter to that memorable circumstance which both determined the character and brought about the political ascendancy, of the Spartans separately: I mean the laws and discipline of Lycurgus.

Of the prevailing inhabitants of Laconia and Messenia, whom we are accustomed to call Achæans and Pylians, so little is known, that we cannot at all measure the difference between them and their Dorian invaders, either in descent, in habits, or

<sup>1</sup> The earliest collection of the names of Olympic victors adopted from the Spartan practice, occurring in the 11th Olympiad, as is testified by the

epigram on Clisthenes, the Megarian. For long as that festival, the Olympic competitions, had continued open to all, (Theophr. l. 6.



in intelligence. There appears no trace of any influence of dialect among the various parts of the population of Laconia: the Messenians alike of Aithra, to the Peloponnesian war, speak the same dialect as the Halots, and the same also as the Argolidians exiled from Corinth: all Doric.<sup>1</sup> Nor has it to be supposed that the Doric dialect was at all peculiar to the people called Dorians. As far as can be made out by the evidence of inscriptions, it seems to have been the dialect of the Phidians, Delphians, Lokrians, Melians, and Achians of Phokis; with respect to the latter, the inscriptions of Thermopylæ in Achæa Phokis afford a proof the more certain and the more cogent of native dialect, because the Phidians were both immediate neighbours and subjects of the Thermians, who speak a variety of the *Mælis*. So too, within Peloponnesos, we find evidence of Doric dialect among the Achians in the north of Peloponnesos—the Dryopis inhabitants of Herakleia<sup>2</sup>—and the Eleuthero-Lakians, or Lakonian townsfolk (comprised of Perikoi and Halots), emancipated by the Romans in the second century A.D. Concerning the speech of that population whom the invading Dorians found in Laconia, we have no means of judging: the presumption would rather be that it did not differ materially from the Doric. Theophrastus designates the Corinthians, whom the invading Dorians attacked from the hill Solygeia, as being *Mælians*, and Strabo speaks both of the Achians as an *Mælis* nation and of the *Mælis* dialect as having been originally predominant in Peloponnesos.<sup>3</sup> But we do not really see what means of information either of these authors possessed respecting the speech of a class which must have been four centuries anterior even to Theophrastus.

Of that which is called the *Mælis* dialect there are three marked and distinguishable varieties—the Lokian, the Thermian, and the Boeotian; the Thermian forming a mean term between the other two. Ahrneus has shown that the ancient grammatical critics are accustomed to affirm, indiscriminately, as belonging to the *Mælis* dialect generally, which in truth belong only to the Lokian variety of it, or to the *phænis*

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. vi. 121, et. 42; Strabon. vii. 48, where the tradition of origin of the war about the peninsula delivered up all the different theories.

<sup>2</sup> Strabon. l. c. 42; Thucyd. vii. 42; Strabon. l. c. 42; Thucyd. vii. 42; Strabon. l. c. 42.

<sup>3</sup> Thucyd. vi. 42; Strabon. vii. 42; p. 100.



These positions represent all our scanty information regarding these varieties of Gaeetic speech which are not known to us by written works. The little presumption which can be relied upon them fosters the belief that the Doric population of Lemnos and Mitylene found there a dialect little different from that which they brought with them—a conclusion which it is the more necessary to state distinctly, since the work of G. Müller has caused an exaggerated estimate to be formed of the distinctive purification whereby Doric was parted off from the rest of Hellen.

# CHAPTER VI.

## LAW AND DISCIPLINE OF LYCURGUS AT SPARTA.

Plutarch begins his biography of Lycurgus with the following concise words:—

"Concerning the lawgiver Lycurgus we can assert absolutely nothing which is not controverted: there are different stories in respect to his birth, his travels, his death, and also his mode of proceeding, political as well as legislative; least of all is the time in which he lived agreed upon."

*Lycurgus—  
author of  
the Laws of  
Sparta—  
proceeding  
him.*

And this uncertainty is but too well borne out by the unsatisfactory nature of the accounts which we read, not only in Plutarch himself, but in those other authors out of whom we are obliged to make up our idea of the remarkable Lycurgean system. If we examine the sources from which Plutarch's life of Lycurgus is derived, it will appear that—excepting the poets Alcman, Tyrtæus, and Stesichorus, from whom he has borrowed less than we could have wished—he has no authorities older than Xenophanes and Pæon: Aristotle is cited several times, and is unquestionably the best of his witnesses, but the greater number of them belong to the century subsequent to that philosopher. Neither Herodotus nor Ephorus is named, though the former furnishes some brief but interesting particulars—and the latter also (as far as we can judge from the fragments remaining) entered at large into the proceedings of the Spartan lawgiver.<sup>1</sup>

Lycurgus is described by Herodotus as made and guardian to King Leobates, of the Eurythæonid or Agid line of Spartan kings; and thus would place him, according to the received chronology, about 250 years before the first recorded Olympiad (about B.C. 776).<sup>2</sup> All the

*Uncertain—  
the account  
in  
proceedings.*

<sup>1</sup> See *Ælian*, *Historia de Pæoniæ*, lib. viii. c. 12. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, l. vi. *Strabo*, *Strabo*.

See also this in the statement of the *Lycurgean* chronology.



that there had existed two persons named Lycurgus, and that the acts of both had been ascribed to one. It is plain from hence that there was no certainty attainable, even in the third century before the Christian era, respecting the date or parentage of Lycurgus.

Theorydide, without mentioning the name of Lycurgus, informs us that it was "600 years and somewhat more" anterior to the close of the Peloponnesian war;<sup>1</sup> when the Spartans emerged from their previous state of desperate internal discord, and entered upon "their present polity". We may fairly presume that this alludes to the Lycurgean discipline and constitution, which Theorydide must thus have conceived as introduced about B.C. 430—420—coinciding with something near the commencement of the reign of king Tiberius. In as far as it is possible to form an opinion, under evidence as thin as scanty and so discordant, I incline to adopt the opinion of Theorydide as to the time at which the Lycurgean constitution was introduced at Sparta. The state of "anarchy" and good order which that constitution brought about—combined with the healing of great previous internal divisions, which had tended much to subvert them—is represented (and with great plausibility) as the grand cause of the victorious career beginning with king Tiberius, the conqueror of Argolis, Flaris, and Jerusalem. Therefore it would seem, in the absence of better evidence, that a date, connecting the fresh stimulus of the new discipline with the reign of Tiberius, is more probable than any epoch either later or earlier.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Theoryd. l. vi.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Clinton fixes the legislation of Lycurgus, "in necessarily rich Theorydide, at about 430 B.C. and the reformer at 600 years, about 1030 years previous (Greek History, v. l. c. 2, p. 146). On this point see the remarks of Clinton, *op. cit.* (v. ii. vol. ii. p. 146, *supra*, p. 147).

On that subject, Mr. Clinton collects and digests the various statements respecting the date of Lycurgus; now and then alluding to Theophrast. l. ii. c. 12, and Theophrast. p. 100—101.

The evidence in these statements need, I think, be taken as they stand, for they cannot be corrected apart by the help of arbitrary suppositions,

which only mislead us by projecting a date of supposed reign there is none to justify. I agree with Mr. Clinton in thinking that the statement of Theophrast is less to be taken as the best authority. But I altogether dissent from his supposition, which is an anomaly with Aristotle, according to John Serrarius, and almost impugned with respect to the passage of Theophrast where that author calls Lycurgus the guardian and ruler of established the Spartan constitution. Mr. Clinton says—"From the authority of the last cited Lycurgus was ascribed to the older laws (the Probitas, it is asserted that the passage must be interpreted) p. 147, and he interprets us to extend the



were doctrinaire Dorians in Eritia, but we have no proof that these peculiar institutions belonged to them more than to the other inhabitants of the island. That the Spartans had an original organisation and tendencies, common to them with the other Dorians, we may readily conceive; but the Lyturgian constitution impressed upon them a peculiar tendency which took them out of the general march, and rendered them the best fit of all states to be cited as an example of the class-distinctions of Dorian. One of the sacred causes, which made the Spartan institutions work so impressively upon the Grecian mind, was their perfect simplicity, combined with the conspicuous ascendancy of the state in which they were manifested; while the Eretan constitution, even admitting their partial resemblance (which was chiefly in the institution of the *Spesitia*, and was altogether more in form than in spirit) to Sparta, was too insignificant to attract notice except from speculative observers. It is therefore a mistake on the part of O. Müller to treat Sparta as the type and representative of Dorians generally, and very many of the positions advanced in his History of the Dorians require to be modified when this mistake is pointed out.

The first explicit fact to notice respecting the institutions ascribed to Lyturgus is the very early period at which they had their commencement: it seems <sup>early date</sup> impossible to place this period later than 800 B.C. <sup>of Lyturgus</sup> 800. Words not said, nor have we a right to expect, trustworthy history in reference to events so early. If we have one foot on historical ground, inasmuch as the institutions themselves are real, the other foot will float in the unfulfilled region of myth, when we strive to comprehend the generating causes: the most yet possible which hinders us from distinguishing between the god and the man. The light in which Lyturgus appeared, to an intelligent Greek of the fifth century before the Christian era, is so clearly, yet briefly depicted, in the following passage of Herodotus, that I cannot do better than translate it:—

"In the very early times (Herodotus observed) the Spartans were among themselves the most lawless of all Greeks, <sup>the state of Lyturgus</sup> and unapproachable by foreigners. Their transition to good legal order took place in the following manner. When Lyturgus, a Spartan of considerable, visited Delphi to



consult the oracle, the instant that he entered the sanctuary, the Pythian priestess exclaimed,—

"Thou, not come, Lycurgus, to my altars, beloved by Zeus and by all the Olympian gods. Is it so that or so mean that I am to address thee in the spirit? I hesitate—and yet, Lycurgus, I incline more to call thee a god!"

(He speaks the Pythian proverb.) "Moreover, in addition to these words, some affirm that the Pythia revealed to him the order of things now established among the Spartans. But the Lacedæmonians themselves say, that Lycurgus, when guardian of his nephew Leobates king of the Spartans, introduced these institutions out of Kreta. No sooner had he obtained this guardianship than he changed all the institutions into their present form, and took severely against any transgression of it. Next, he constituted the military divisions, the Ekatosties and the Triakades, as well as the *Synolla* or public assembly; he also, further, appointed the *ephors* and the *moisai*. By this means the Spartans passed from bad to good order: to Lycurgus, after his death, they built a temple, and they still worship him reverentially. And as might naturally be expected in a productive soil, and with an immeasurable number of men, they immediately took a start forward, and established so much that they could not be content to remain tranquil within their own limits," &c.

Such is our oldest statement (borrowed from Herodotus) respecting Lycurgus, according to him that secure order of things which the writer witnessed at Sparta. Thucydides also, though not mentioning Lycurgus, agrees in stating that the system among the Lacedæmonians, as he saw it, had been adopted by them four centuries previously, had passed them from the most hideous disorders, and had immediately conducted them to prosperity and success. Thucydides, whose writings a little preceded those of Herodotus, not only did not say more than Thucydides make mention of Lycurgus, but can hardly be thought to have attached any importance to the name; since he attributed the constitution of Sparta to the two kings, Rhythadems and Procles.\*

But those later writers, from whose Plutarch chiefly compiled his biography, profess to be far better informed on the subject of

\* Herodot. 1. 66—68; Thucyd. 1. 88.

\* Plutarch, vitæ p. 101.

Lykurgos, and enter more into detail. His father, we are told, was assassinated during the growing state of barbarism; his elder brother Polipheides died early, leaving a pregnant widow, who made to Lykurgos propositions that he should marry her and become king. But Lykurgos, repudiating the offer with indignation, availed the birth of his young nephew Cleodemos, held up the child publicly in the agora as the future king of Sparta, and immediately relinquished the authority which he had provisionally assumed. However, the widow and her brother Lamedon moved slanderous accusations against him, of designs amounting to the life of the infant king,—accusations which he deemed it proper to evade by a temporary absence. Accordingly he left Sparta and went to Krita, where he studied the polity and customs of the different cities; next he visited Ionia and Egypt, and (as some authors affirm) Libya, Persia, and even India. While in Ionia, he is reported to have obtained from the descendants of Krotophytes a copy of the Homeric poems, which had not up to that time become known in Peloponnesus: there were not wanting authors, indeed, who said that he had conversed with Homer himself.<sup>1</sup>

Cleodemos  
descends at  
Plethos.

Return of  
Lykurgos—  
his long ab-  
sence from  
Sparta.

Meanwhile the young king Cleodemos grew up and assumed the sceptre, as representing the Proklid or Karyopoid family. But the reins of government had become more relaxed, and the Cleodemos was then even, when Lykurgos returned. Finding that the two kings as well as the people were weary of so disastrous a condition, he set himself to the task of applying a corrective, and with this view consulted the Delphian oracle; from which he received strong assurances of the divine encouragement, together with one or more special injunctions (the primitive Rhætes of the constitution) which he brought with him to Sparta.<sup>2</sup> He then suddenly presented himself in the agora, with thirty of the most distinguished Spartans, all in arms, as his guards and pageants. King Cleodemos, though at first terrified, when informed

He is sent  
to the  
Delphian  
oracle by  
order of the  
king.

<sup>1</sup> Ploetoch, *Erweg.* 4. 4. 4.

<sup>2</sup> For an instructive notice of the work as well as the manner of this great Spartan, see, *Willems* *History of the Spartan State*, p. 101. *Willems* also

the first edition of this History. The edition of this History of Sparta is not complete, but the work is not finished, and the author has not yet finished it. The author has not yet finished it.



Such was the Spartan political constitution as fixed by Lykurgus; but a century afterwards (so Plutarch's account runs), under the kings Polydorus and Theopompus, two important alterations were made. A rider was then attached to the old Lykurgian *Eklesia*, by which it was provided that "in case the people decided crookedly, the senate with the kings should reverse their decisions;"<sup>1</sup> while another change, perhaps intended as a

12.—As this act substantially removed all the distinction between the assembly of kings in the field and in the city, it seems that the laws of the Lykurgian *Eklesia* were in effect, as they were in substance, abolished. Hence the assembly of the people in the city was now a new assembly, and a new constitution. The old constitution was a *Gerousia* and a *Gerousia* was a council of elders, and a council of elders was a *Gerousia*. The new constitution was a *Gerousia* and a *Gerousia* was a council of elders, and a council of elders was a *Gerousia*. The old constitution was a *Gerousia* and a *Gerousia* was a council of elders, and a council of elders was a *Gerousia*. The new constitution was a *Gerousia* and a *Gerousia* was a council of elders, and a council of elders was a *Gerousia*.

13.—The *Eklesia* was probably created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law.

14.—The *Eklesia* was probably created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law.

15.—The *Eklesia* was probably created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law.

16.—The *Eklesia* was probably created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law.

17.—The *Eklesia* was probably created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law.

18.—The *Eklesia* was probably created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law.

19.—The *Eklesia* was probably created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law.

20.—The *Eklesia* was probably created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law. The *Eklesia* was created by the Lykurgian law, and the *Gerousia* was created by the Lykurgian law.



latter as well as the school of privilege which it was to exercise ; consecrating the whole by the erection of the temples of East Hellas and Admetus Hellas. The view of the subject presented by Plutarch as well as by Plato,<sup>1</sup> as if the senate were an entire novelty, does not consist with the pictures of the old age. Hence we may more naturally imagine that the Lycurgus political constitution, apart from the sphere who were afterwards tacked to it, presents only the old features of the heroic government of Greece, defined and regularised in a particular manner. The presence of two co-existent and co-ordinate kings, indeed, according to hereditary descent and both belonging to the gens of Horkleids, is something peculiar to Sparta—the origin of which receives no other explanation than a reference to the two sons of Aristodemos, Eurykleids and Pookleids. These two primitive ancestors are a type of the two lines of Spartan kings; for they are said to have passed their lives in perpetual dissensions, which was the habitual state of the two contemporaneous kings at Sparta. While the co-existence of the pair of kings, equal in power and constantly thwarting each other, had often a fatal effect upon the course of public measures, it was nevertheless a security to the state against successful violence,<sup>2</sup> acting in the establishment of a despotism, on the part of any ambitious individual among the royal line.

During five successive centuries of Spartan history, from Polydorus and Theopompus downwards, no such violence was attempted by any of the kings,<sup>3</sup> until the times of Agis III. and Kleomenes III. (330 B.C. to 200 B.C.). The importance of Greece had at this last-mentioned period irretrievably declined, and the independent political action which she once possessed had become subordinate to the more powerful force either of the Attican mountaineers (the ruler among her own sons) or to Epirotic, Macedonian, and Asiatic foreigners, preparatory to the final

<sup>1</sup> Plato, *Legg.* II. p. 80; Plato, *Rep.* III. p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Plato, *Legg.* II. p. 81; Aristotle, *Polit.* II. 2, 3.

<sup>3</sup> The conspiracy of Pammenes, when the ruler of Argos, was against the king of Sparta, is the only instance of violence, in which the king himself was not the victim.

Plutarch, however, refers them against the constitution of Lycurgus as necessary, though substantially necessary of the project was to make the kings to be, and, and Aristotle treats him as a generalising to give the power of the kings (Polit. II. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

champion by the Romans. But amongst all the Grecian states, Sparta had declined the most; her ascendancy was totally gone, and her peculiar training and discipline (to which she had closely owed it) had degenerated in every way. Under these unfavourable circumstances, two young kings, Ages and Kleomenes—the former a generous enthusiast, the latter more violent and ambitious—conceived the design of restoring the Lycurgean constitution to its supposed primitive purity, with the hope of reviving both the spirit of the people and the ascendancy of the state. But the Lycurgean constitution had been, even in the time of Xerophanes,<sup>1</sup> in part, as I hold, not fully realised in practice—much less was it a reality in the days of Kleomenes and Ages; moreover it was an ideal which admitted of being coloured according to the fancy or feelings of those reformers who professed, and probably believed, that they were aiming at its genuine restoration. What the reforming kings found most in their way was, the uncontrolled authority, and the conservative disposition, of the ephors—which they naturally contrasted with the original fulness of the kingly power, where kings and ephors stood alone. Among the

various ways in which men's ideas of what the primitive constitution had been, were modified by the feelings of their own time (you shall presently see some other instances of this), is probably to be reckoned the assertion of Kleomenes respecting the first appointment of the ephors. Kleomenes affirmed that the ephors had originally been nothing more than subordinates and deputies of the kings chosen by the latter to perform for a time their duties during the long absence of the Messenian war. Starting from this hostile position, and profiting by the dissensions of the two kings,<sup>2</sup> they had in process of time, especially by the abolition of the ephor *Antelypeus*, found means first to constitute themselves an independent board, then to usurp to themselves more and more of the kingly authority, until they at last reduced the kings to a state of miserable humiliation and impotence. As a proof of the primitive relation between the kings and the ephors, he alluded to that which was the custom at Sparta in his own time. When the ephors sent for either of the kings, the

<sup>1</sup> Xerophanes, *Spacilla*, *Isand*, v. 14. *de Agrippa* (the ancient lawyer in

<sup>2</sup> *Plutarch*, *Agis*, v. 15. *Thucyd.* *de Spartan*, *de*





Such were the relations which had once subsisted between the kings and the ephors; though in later times these relations had been so completely reversed, that Polybius considers the former as essentially subordinate to the latter—acknowledging it as a point of duty in the kings to respect the ephors "as their fathers."<sup>1</sup> And such is decidedly the state of things throughout all the better known period of history which we shall hereafter traverse. The ephors are the general directors of public affairs<sup>2</sup> and the supreme controlling board holding in check every other authority in the state, without any assignable limit to their powers. The extraordinary ascendancy of these magistrates is particularly mentioned in the list cited by Aristotle, that they exempted themselves from the public discipline, so that their self-indulgent year of office stood in marked contrast with the sobriety, earnestness and soberness common to men and poor alike. The kings are reduced to a certain number of special functions, combined with privileges partly religious, partly honorary: their most important political attribute is, that they act as officers general of the military force on foreign expeditions. But even here we trace the sensible decline of their power. For whereas Herodotus was informed, and it probably had been the old privilege, that the king could levy war against whomever he chose, and that no Spartan could insult him on pain of encountering death;<sup>3</sup>—we shall see throughout the best known periods of this history that it is usually the ephors (with or without the senate and public assembly) who determine upon war—the king only takes the command when the army is put on the march. Aristotle seems to treat the Spartan king as a sort of hereditary general; but even in this privilege shackles were put upon him—for two out of the five ephors accompanied the army, and their power seems to have been not seldom invoked to secure obedience to his orders.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Polyb. xvii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Aristotle, Polyt. ii. 4. 14-16. "They do not allow the king to appear any longer presiding at assemblies: who religiously were the only admitted men (even) to the public political assemblies for deliberation."

<sup>3</sup> Herodotus, vi. 40.

<sup>4</sup> Aristotle, ii. 1, 2. Euseb. Hæst.

Legend. ii. 32. Herodotus, relating the Peloponnesian war, mentions, Eusebius, Hæst. ii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

A special institution was put on the footing of the king, an military order model founded, in 181 A.D., after the Hellenistic institution of 181 A.D. of Antiochus against Jews. It was

The direct political powers of the kings were thus greatly curtailed; yet importance in many ways was still left to them. They possessed large royal domains in many of the townships of the Paroski. They received frequent personal presents, and when victims were offered to the gods, the skins and other portions belonged to them, as portions;<sup>1</sup> they had their votes in the senate, which, if they were absent, were given on their behalf by each of the other senators as were most nearly related to them: the adoption of children received its formal accomplishment in their presence—and conferring status as free, for the hand of an orphaned orphan, helots, was adjudicated by them. But above all, their root was deep in the religious feelings of the people. Their pre-eminence brought the entire state with a divine paternity. They, the chiefs of the Herakleids, were the special protectors of the soul of Sparta from the gods—the occupation of the Demos being only sanctified and blessed by Zeus for the purpose of establishing the children of Herakles in the valley of the Eurotas.<sup>2</sup> They represented the state in its relations with the gods, being by right protectors of Zeus Laseomantis (the slayer of the god and the country embracing into one) and of Zeus Uranios, and offering the monthly sacrifices necessary to secure divine protection to the people. Though individual persons might sometimes be put aside, nothing short of a new divine revelation could induce the Spartans to step out of the passive homage of Eurythens and Praxias. Moreover, the remarkable securing ceremony which took place at the death of every king, seems to indicate that the two kingly families—which counted themselves Achæans,<sup>3</sup> not Dorians—were considered as the great common bond of union

that provided that the Spartans were placed almost always accordingly. The king in every appearance occupied a throne.

<sup>1</sup> The whole ceremony of offering to the gods the victims offered to the Spartans was accompanied by a special form of the public prayer in the temple, according to the king, see, Herodotus, *History of Greece*, lib. 1, p. 125, *King of Sparta*, *Original Documents*, No. 100.

<sup>2</sup> *Herodotus*, *History*, lib. 1, ch. 100; *King of Sparta*, *Original Documents*, No. 100.

*Herodotus*, *History*, lib. 1, ch. 100; *King of Sparta*, *Original Documents*, No. 100.

*Herodotus*, *History*, lib. 1, ch. 100; *King of Sparta*, *Original Documents*, No. 100.

*Herodotus*, *History*, lib. 1, ch. 100; *King of Sparta*, *Original Documents*, No. 100.

*Herodotus*, *History*, lib. 1, ch. 100; *King of Sparta*, *Original Documents*, No. 100.





they take the sense of the senate and the public assembly<sup>1</sup>—each seems to have been the habit on questions of war and peace. It appears however that persons charged with hostilities, treason, or capital offences generally, were tried before the senate. We read of several instances in which the kings were tried and severely fined, and in which their houses were condemned to be raised to the ground, probably by the senate on the proposition of the ephors. In one instance, it seems that the ephors initiated by their own authority a fine even upon Agamemnon.<sup>2</sup>

War and peace appear to have been submitted, on most, if not every, occasion, to the senate and the public assembly ;<sup>3</sup> no matter would reach the latter until it had passed through the former. And we find some few occasions on which the decision of the public assembly was a real expression of opinion, and operative as to the result—as for example, the assembly which immediately preceded and resolved upon the Peloponnesian war. Here, in addition to the serious hazard of the case and the general opinion of a Spartan temperament, there was the great personal weight and experience of king Archidamus opposed to the war, though the ephors were favourable to it.<sup>4</sup> The public assembly, under such peculiar circumstances, really manifested an opinion and came to a decision. But for the most part, it seems to have been little better than an inoperative formality. The general rule permitted no open discussion, nor could any private citizen speak except by special leave from the magistrates. Perhaps even the general liberty in disaffairs, if given, might have been of no avail, for not only was there no power of public speaking, but no habit of concerning public measures, at Sparta: nothing was more characteristic of the government than the extreme secrecy of its proceedings.<sup>5</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> *Plutarch* tells the story out of history (*Plut. Pelopon.* 61, § 10).

<sup>2</sup> *The case of Agamemnon*, *Plutarch*, *op. cit.* 61, § 10; *Plutarch*, *Pericles*, 13, § 2, 3; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Plutarch* tells the story generally, see *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Plutarch* tells the story of the ephors in *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1; *Plutarch*, *Themistocles*, 1, § 1.



life, we may readily believe that some of them continued to act after the period of extreme and disqualifying youth—which, though the extraordinary respect of the Lacedæmonians for old age would doubtless tolerate it, could not fail to impede the influence of the body as a concurrent element of government.

The brief sketch here given of the Spartan government will show, that though Greek theorists found a difficulty in determining under what class they should arrange it,<sup>1</sup> it was in substance a close, unscrupulous, and well-observed oligarchy—including within it as subordinate those portions which had more been democratic, the kings and the senate, and suffering the citizen, without sharing the mischief of the system, by its annual change of the ruling sphere. We must at the same time distinguish the government from the Lyrægon discipline and education, which doubtless tended much to equalise rich and poor, in respect to personal life, habits, and enjoyments. Herodotus (and seemingly also Xenophon) thought that the form just described was that which the government had originally received from the hand of Lyrægon. Now, though there is good reason for supposing otherwise, and for believing the sphere to be a subsequent addition—yet the mere fact, that Herodotus was so informed at Sparta, points our attention to one important attribute of the Spartan polity, which it is proper to bring into view. This attribute is, its unparalleled steadiness for four or five successive centuries, in the midst of governments like the Greeks, all of which had undergone more or less of fluctuation.

No considerable revolution—not even any palpable or formal change—occurred in it from the days of the Minæan war down to those of Ages III. in spite of the irreparable blow which the power and territory of the state sustained from Epaminondas and the Thebans, the form of government nevertheless remained unchanged. It was the only government in Greece which could trace an unbroken pedigree descent from a high antiquity and from its real or supposed

<sup>1</sup> The sphere was sometimes considered as a democratical element, because many Spartan citizens had a share of governing sphere; sometimes as a despotic element, because in

the exercise of their power they were subject to little restraint, and so responsibility; see Fœbe, *loc. cit.* p. 11; Aristotle, *Polit.* 2. 2. 10; 2. 2. 11.

border. Now this was one of the main circumstances (among others which will hereafter be mentioned) of the astonishing ascendancy which the Spartans acquired over the Hellenic mind, and which they will not be found at all to deserve by any superior ability in the conduct of affairs. The steadiness of their political sympathies—exhibited at one time by getting down the tyrants or despots, at another by overthrowing the democracies—stood in the place of ability, and even the recognised failings of their government were often covered by the sentiment of respect for its early commencement and uninterrupted continuance. If such a feeling acted on the Greeks generally,<sup>1</sup> much more powerful was its action upon the Spartans themselves in reflecting that haughty enjoyment for which they stood distinguished. And it is to be observed that the Spartans were continued to be out on the old-fashioned scale, and susceptible of unobscuring influence, longer than that of most other people of Greece. The ancient legendary faith, and devoted submission to the Delphian oracles, remained among them unshaken, at a time when various influences had considerably undermined it among their fellow-Hellens and neighbours. But though the unchanged title and form of the government thus contributed to its imposing effect, both at home and abroad, the access of internal degeneracy were not the less ready at work, in undermining its efficiency. It has been already stated that the number of qualified citizens went on continually diminishing, and even of this diminished number a larger proportion than before were needy, since the landed property tended constantly to concentrate itself in fewer hands. These grew up in the way a body of discontent, which had not originally existed, both among the poorer citizens, and among those who had lost their franchise as citizens; thus aggravating the danger arising from Pericles and Nicias, who will be presently noticed.

We pass from the political constitution of Sparta to the civil rank and distribution, economical relations, and lastly the peculiar system of habits, education and discipline, said to have been established among the Lacedæmonians by Lycurgus. Here again we shall find ourselves imperfectly informed as to the

<sup>1</sup> A question of the way in which in Aristotle, *De* vii. (Panciatius) p. 126, this analogy was treated may be seen 126.













Zurich, and most of the old German cantons of Switzerland) embodied in the Laconianian aggregate, which was governed exclusively by the kings, senate, and citizens of Sparta.

When we come to describe the democracy of Athens after the revolution of Kleisthenes, we shall find the demes, or local townships and villages of Attica, incorporated as equal and constituent fractions of the metropolis called The Demes (or The City) of Athens, so that a district of Acharnes or Epistauris is at the same time a full Athenian citizen. But the relation of the Peloponnesian townships to Sparta is one of inequality and obediencce, though both belong to the same political aggregate, and make up together the free Laconianian community. In like manner, Ormen and other places were townships of men personally free, but politically dependent on Argo—Akrophia on Tefeo—Chersonese on Orobomena—and various Thessalian towns on Pharsalia and Larissa.<sup>1</sup> This condition carried with it a sentiment of degradation, and a painful remembrance of that autonomy for which every Ormenian earnestly thirsted,<sup>2</sup> while being maintained through superior force, it had a natural tendency, perhaps without the deliberate wish of the reigning city, to degenerate into practical oppression. Not in addition to this general tendency, the peculiar situation of a Sparteia, while it imperied force, fortitude, and regimental practice, was at the same time so rigorously pacific, that it rendered him harsh, unaccommodating, and incapable of sympathizing with the ordinary wants of Greece. Feeling,—not to mention the rapacity and love of money, which is attested, by good evidence, as belonging to the Spartan Character;<sup>3</sup> and which we should hardly have expected to find in the pupils of Lykurgos. As Hermotas got of their native city,<sup>4</sup> and in relations with foreigners, the Sparteians seem to have been more unpopular than other Greeks, and we may presume that a similar haughty roughness pervaded their

Special district of the world. Fortified in Larissa.

<sup>1</sup> Herodot. vii. 71-72; Joseph. Bellum. c. 1-4; Strabo. lvi. 71-72.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo. lvi. c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

the same language, Bellum. c. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

<sup>3</sup> Joseph. Bellum. c. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo. lvi. c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

allies with their own Peræidæ, who were bound to them certainly by no tie of affection, and who for the most part revolved after the battle of Lædæa as soon as the diversion of Lædæa by Spærcidæ enabled them to do so with safety.

Lysander, taking his point of departure from the old Spartan maxim, *with deliberate intent conquest and triple partition of Lædæa* among all Doric Peloponnesians among the three <sup>as to the</sup> Heraklidæ brethren, divides the two wings of the Peræidæ.

Peræidæ townships from internal dissensions among the conquerors of Sparta. According to him, the period immediately succeeding the conquest was one of three intestine wars in newly-conquered Sparta, between the Few and the Many,—the oligarchy and the demos. The former being victorious, two important measures were the consequences of their victory. They banished the defeated Many from Sparta into Lædæa, reserving the residence in Sparta exclusively for themselves; they assigned to them the smallest and least fertile half of Lædæa, monopolising the larger and better for themselves; and they disseminated them into many very small townships, or subordinate little communities, while they concentrated themselves actually at Sparta. To these precautions for ensuring domesticity they added another not less important. They established among their own Spartans without equality of legal privileges and democratical government, some to take the greatest securities for internal harmony; which harmony, according to the judgment of Lysander, had been but too effectually perverted, enabling the Spartans to convert their domestic ones oppressed Greeks,—like the sword of pirate<sup>1</sup> for the spoliation of the peaceful. The Peræidæ townships (he tells us), while deprived of all the privileges of freemen, were exposed to all the toils, as well as to an unfair share of the dangers of war. The Spartan authorities put them in situations red upon enterprises which they deemed too dangerous for their own citizens; and what was still worse, the spheres presented the power of getting to death, without any form of preliminary trial, as many Peræidæ as they pleased.\*

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, *Peræidæ*. Cf. *op. cit.* p. 155. *Some editors* for *oligarchy* and *democracy* read *oligarchy* and *democracy*. The *oligarchy* and *democracy* are the same as the *oligarchy* and *democracy* of the *op. cit.*

*the better*, rather *oligarchy* and *democracy* than *oligarchy* and *democracy*. *Lysander*, *Peræidæ* (Peræidæ) p. 155-157. The *oligarchy* is the same as the *oligarchy* of the *op. cit.*





but that Agis, son of Eurythene, had deprived them of this equal position, and degraded them into dependent subjects of the latter. At least the two narratives both agree in presenting that the Periklids had once enjoyed a better position, from which they had been extruded by violence. And the policy which instinctively resorted to the victorious Spartan oligarchs,—of driving out the Dorian from concentrated residence in the city to disseminated residence in many separate and insignificant townships,—seems to be the expression of that proceeding which in his time was considered among the most efficient preventives against refractory subjects,—the *Dioikete*, or breaking up of a town-aggregate into villages. We cannot judge, in the statement any historical authority.<sup>1</sup> Moreover the divisions of Laconia into six districts, together with its distribution into townships (or the distribution of settlers into pre-existing townships), which Ephorus ascribed to the first Dorian king, are all deductions from the primitive legendary account, which described the Dorian conquest as achieved at one stroke, and must all be dismissed, if we suppose it to have been achieved gradually. This gradual conquest is admitted by G. Müller and by many of the ablest subsequent inquirers—who nevertheless seem to have the contrary supposition involuntarily present to their minds when they estimate the early Spartan history, and always unconsciously imagine the Spartans as masters of all Laconia. We cannot even assert that Laconia was ever under one government before the commencement of the successive conquests of Sparta.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Arnold, in his *Description of the Spartan Constitution*, ascribed to the first Dorian king, the distribution of the Dorians into six districts, p. 205. He gives greater credence to the legendary value of this narrative of Eurythene than I am inclined to do. On the other hand, Mr. G. J. Lewis, in his *History of the Spartan Constitution* (Oxford: Clarendon, vol. I, p. 20), mentions the "supposed distribution of originally independent units of 'high-land' villages into six subdivisions, perhaps, that the plan of the two districts was made. In the G. Lewis mentioned article, most of the difficult points respecting the Spartan constitution with its history related and discussed in a manner highly instructive.

Another point in the statement of Aristotle is, that the Dorians at the time of the original conquest of Laconia were only four in number (Eth. Nic. 1292a, 20). Dr. Lewis assigns this statement to the poet, and answers, "I suspect that Aristotle, in mentioning this number of the Dorians at the original conquest, has adopted to his description the actual number of the Spartans in his own time" (Proc. Acad. 2, p. 209).

This seems to me a plausible conjecture, and it illustrates as well the absence of definite words *hellenes* or *hellenes* in the fragments referred to, as the method which they tend to supply the deficiency.





smaller half must have been the property of the Perioikoi, who must besides have carried on most of the commerce of export and import—the *mitilamproi* enterprise, and the distribution of internal produce—which the territory exhibited; thus as Sparta ever modified its such computations. And thus the peculiar training of Lakedæmon, by throwing all these employments into the hands of the Perioikoi, opened to them a new source of importance which the dependent servitude of *Argos*, of *Thesia*, or of *Corinthians* would not supply.

The Helots of Lacedæmon were Coloni or vassal bound to the soil, who tilled it for the benefit of the Spartan proprietors certainly—probably, of Perioikoi proprietors also. They were the rustic population of the country, who dwelt, not in towns, but either in small villages<sup>1</sup> or in detached farms, both in the district immediately surrounding Sparta, and round the Perioikoi Lacedæmon towns also. Of course these were also Helots who lived in Sparta and other towns, and did the work of domestic slaves—but such was not the general character of the class. We cannot doubt that the Dorian conquest from Sparta found this class in the condition of villagers and detached rustics; but whether they were dependent upon pre-existing Achaean proprietors, or independent like much of the Achaean village population, is a question which we cannot answer. In either case, however, it is easy to conceive that the village lands (with the cultivators upon them) were the most easy to appropriate for the benefit of masters resident at Sparta; while the towns, with the district immediately around them, furnished both dwelling and maintenance to the outgoing detachments of Dorians. If the Spartans had succeeded in their attempt

1. *Polis*—  
essentially  
villages.

that they paid direct taxation (which they do not) upon the lands cultivated by the Spartan Helots, who are distinguished only by being deeper tilled than others. And though the principle of taxation by the state, there are practical reasons (according to Aristotle) in the mode of assessing it. "The Helots cultivate the observed being the largest landholders, their lands are not so much divided and their payment of property-tax"—i.e., they work naturally at their state's expense. If the Spartans paid taxes the only persons with paid slaves or

property-tax, this observation of Aristotle would have had no meaning. In principle, the tax was assessed both on lands deeper tilled, and on the smaller holdings of the Perioikoi. In practice, the Spartans helped their Helots to escape the tax principle.

"The village character of the Helots is distinctly marked by Aristotle in his description of the Helots of the island of Rhodes." "Helotsan system of land and rule attributes wealth, agriculture, general intelligence, national character, and states that the Helots are not so much as the Spartans."

to enlarge their territory by the conquest of Arcadia,<sup>1</sup> they might very probably have converted Tigea and Mantinea into Peloponnesian towns, with a diminished territory inhabited (either wholly or in part) by Dorian settlers—while they would have made over to propitiation in Sparta much of the village lands of the Minæid, Anceæ, and Parrhasid, belonging to the inhabitants. The distinction between a town and a village population seems the main ground of the different treatment of Helots and Peræid in Laconia. A considerable proportion of the Helots were of genuine Dorian race, being the Dorians Messenians west of Mount Taygetus, subsequently conquered and aggregated to this class of dependent cultivators, who, as a class, must have begun to exist from the very first establishment of the invading Dorians in the district round Sparta. From whence the name of Helots arose we do not clearly make out: Ephorus deduced it from the town of Helos, on the southern coast, which the Spartans are said to have taken after a resistance so obstinate as to provoke them to

Ephorus  
on the  
subject  
of the  
Helots.  
Spartan  
and  
treatment.

deal very rigorously with the captives. There are many reasons for rejecting this story, and another etymology has been proposed according to which Helos is synonymous with captive: this is more plausible, yet still not convincing.<sup>2</sup> The Helots lived in the rural villages as serfs or glaii, cultivating their lands and paying over their rent to the master at Sparta, but enjoying their houses, wives, families, and mutual neighbourly feelings apart from the master's view. They were never sold out of the country, and probably never sold at all; belonging not so much to the master as to the state, which constantly called upon them for military service, and recompensed their bravery or activity with a grant of freedom. When the Themistocles of Phœnix took out three hundred Peræotæ of his own, to aid the Athenians against Amphipolis: these Themistoclean Peræotæ were in many points analogous to the Helots, being individual Spartans possessed of the like power over the latter. The Helots were thus a part of the state, having their domestic and social sympathies developed, a certain power of acquiring property,<sup>3</sup> and the consciousness

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus i. 62. According to some & according to others, the Dorians drove the Arcadians out of the Peloponnese. See G. Müller, *Herodotus* ii. c. 15. Ephorus ap. Strabo, vii. p. 336, Strabo.

and, as Ephorus, ii. c. 15, observes, the Dorians offered assistance to the Arcadians. It is, however, probable that many Helots who could pay down for their release, or was to gladi-



conquerors, while at home the citizen habitually kept his shield disciplined from its holding-spring to prevent the possibility of its being snatched for the like purpose. Sometimes when Helots were clothed in heavy armour, and then served in the ranks, receiving manumission from the state on the reward of distinguished bravery.)

But Sparta, even at the maximum of her power, was more than once endangered by the reality, and always beset with the apprehension, of Helots' revolt. To prevent or suppress it, the Spartans submitted to insert express stipulation for aid in their treaties with Athens—to invite Athenian troops into the heart of Laconia,—and to practice combinations of cunning and strategy which even yet stand without parallel in the long list of prosecutions for fortifying against domestic. It was in the eighth year of the Peloponnesian war, after the Helots had been called upon for signal military efforts in various ways, and when the Athenians and Messenians were in possession of Pylos, that the Spartans felt especially apprehensive of an outbreak. Anxious to single out the most forward and daring Helots, as the men from whom they had most to dread, they issued proclamation that every member of that class who had rendered distinguished services should make his claims known at Sparta, promising liberty to the most deserving. A large number of Helots came forward to claim the boon: not less than 3000 of them were approved, formally manumitted, and led in solemn procession round the temples, with garlands on their heads, as an inauguration to their coming life of freedom. But the treacherous guard only marked them out as victims for the sacrifice: every man of them forthwith disappeared,—the manner of their death was an untold mystery.

For this dark and bloody deed Thucydides is our witness,<sup>1</sup> and Thucydides describing a contemporary matter into which he had enquired. Upon any less evidence we should have hesitated to believe the statement; but standing as it is thus close above all suspicion, it speaks volumes as to the false man character of the Lacedæ-

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. 2. 35; 2. 36; 2. 37-38. *For more fully to describe, and clearly to illustrate, the fact of its being a matter of great importance, see the following pages.*

Spartan government, while it lays open to us at the same time the intensity of their hate from the Helots. In the constitution of this fatal regiment of brave men, a large number of auxiliaries and instruments must have been employed; yet Theophrastus with all his inquiries could not find out how any of them perished: he tells us that no man knew. We see here a fact which demonstrates unequivocally the impenetrable mystery in which the proceedings of the Spartan government were wrapped,—the absence not only of public discussion, but of public curiosity,—and the perfection with which the sphere reigned over the will, the hands, and the tongues of their Spartan subjects. The Tuscan Council of Ten, with all the facilities for concerted drawing which their city presented, could hardly have accomplished so vast a conspiracy with such invisible means. And we may judge from hence, even if we had no other evidence, how little the habits of a public assembly could have suited either the temper of mind or the march of government at Sparta.

Other proceedings, ascribed to the ephors, against the Helots, are conceived in the same spirit as the vendue just recounted from Theophrastus, though they do not carry with them the same certain attestation. It was a part of the institutions of Lycurgus (according to a statement which Plutarch professes to have borrowed from Archæus) that the ephors should every year declare war against the Helots, in order that the murder of them might be rendered innocent; and that active young Spartans should be armed with daggers and sent about Laconia, in order that they might, either in solitude or at night, assassinate such of the Helots as were considered formidable.<sup>1</sup> This last measure passed by the name of the *Kryptæ*, yet we find some difficulty in determining to what extent it was ever *Kryptæ*—*secret*. That the ephors, indeed, would not be restrained by any scruples of justice or humanity, is plainly shown by the murder of the 3000 Helots above related. But this latter incident really answered its purpose; while a standing practice such as that of the *Kryptæ*, and a formal notice of war given beforehand, would provoke the reaction of despair rather than enforce tranquillity. There seems indeed good evidence that the

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *Lycurg.* c. 56; *Æschylus Fœdus*, p. 354, ed. Orell.





franchise of the number of Spartan citizens had made itself felt.

The manumitted Helots did not pass into the class of Perioeci, —for this purpose a special grant, of the freedom of <sup>status.</sup> some Perioecian township, would probably be required, <sup>but Helots.</sup> —but constituted a class apart, known at the time of the Peloponnesian war by the name of Neodamidae. Being persons who had earned their liberty by signal bravery, they were of course regarded by the Spartans with peculiar apprehension, and, if possible, employed on foreign service,<sup>1</sup> or planted on some foreign soil as settlers. In what manner these freedmen employed themselves, we had no distinct information; but we can hardly doubt that they quitted the Helot village and field, together with the rural costume (the leather cap and chiton) which the Helot commonly wore, and the change of which exposed him to suspicion, if not to punishment, from his jealous masters. Probably they, as well as the disfranchised Spartan citizens (called *Ekpyrnatois* or *Exiloi*), became congregated at Sparta, and found employment either in various trades or in the service of the government.

It has been necessary to give this short sketch of the orders of men who inhabited Lacedæmon, in order to enable us to understand the statements given about the legislation of Lycurgus. The arrangements ascribed to that lawgiver, in the way that Plutarch describes them, presuppose, and do not create, the three orders of Spartans, Perioeci, and Helots. We are told by Plutarch that the disorders which Lycurgus found existing in the state arose in a great measure from the gross inequality of property, and from the luxurious indulgence and unprincipled rapacity of the rich—who had drawn to themselves the greater portion of the lands in the country, leaving a large body of poor, without any lot of land, in hopeless misery and degradation. To this inequality (according to Plutarch) the reforming legislator applied at once a vigorous remedy. He redistributed the whole territory belonging to Sparta, as well as the remainder of Lacedæmon; the former in 9000 equal lots, one to each Spartan citizen; the latter in 80,000 equal lots, one to each Perioecian: of this

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. i. 66.

illegal distribution. I shall speak further presently. Moreover he limited the use of gold and silver money, forbidding vending in the shape of circulating medium but pieces of iron, heavy and scarcely portable; and he forbade<sup>1</sup> to the Spartan citizen every species of industries or money-seeking occupation, agriculture included. He further constituted—though not without strenuous opposition, during the course of which his eye is said to have been knocked out by a violent youth, named Alkander—the *Synitia* or public mess. A certain number of plant tables were provided, and every citizen was required to belong to some one *Synitia*, or of them and habitually to take his meals at it<sup>2</sup>—no *Synitia* new member being admissible without a unanimous ballot in his favour by the previous occupants. Each provided from his lot of land a specified quota of barley-meal, wine, cheese and figs, and a small contribution of money for condiments: game was obtained in addition by hunting in the public forests of the state, while every one who succeeded in the gods,<sup>3</sup> sent to his mess-table a part of the victim killed. From boyhood to old age, every Spartan citizen took his other meals at this public mess, where all shared alike; nor was distinction of any kind allowed, except on signal occasions of service rendered by an individual to the state.

These public *Synitia*, under the management of the *Politarchæ*, were connected with the military distribution, the constant gymnastic training, and the rigorous discipline of detail, enforced by *Lykurgos*. From the early age of seven years, throughout his whole life, as youth and man no less than as boy, the Spartan citizen lived habitually in public, always either himself under drill, gymnastic and military, or a critic and spectator of others—always under the stern and clearness of a rule partly military, partly domestic—estranged from the independence of a separate home—seeing his wife, during the first years after marriage, only by stealth, and maintaining little peculiar relation with his children. The supervision not only of his fellow-citizens, but also of authorized citizens or captains nominated by the state, was perpetually acting upon him: his

<sup>1</sup> *Demosthenes*, *Deus*, *Leg.* c. 1, § 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Plutarch*, *Lykurgos*, c. 15, *section*.  
only mentioned by *Demosthenes*, *Deus*.

<sup>3</sup> *Leg.* c. 1, § 1.

<sup>3</sup> *See* the *section* quoted in *Atticus*, *De* p. 151.





affairs; and that nearly half the landed property of Laconia had come to belong to them. The exemption of the women from all manual labour, in his eye, a pointed contrast with the rigorous discipline imposed upon the men,—and a contrast hardly less pointed with the condition of women in other Grecian cities where they were habitually confined to the interior of the house, and seldom appeared in public. While the Spartan husband went through the hard details of his ancient life, and died on the pleasant fane of the Phœstia or arena, the wife (it appears) maintained an ample and luxurious establishment at home, and she decried to provide for such outlay was one of the means of that love of money which prevailed among men forbidden to enjoy it in the ordinary ways. To explain this antithesis between the treatment of the two sexes at Sparta, Aristotle was informed that Lycurgus had used to bring the women no less than the men under a system of discipline, but that they made so obstinate a resistance as to compel him to desist.<sup>1</sup>

The view here given by the philosopher, and deserving of some careful attention, is not easy to reconcile with that of Xenophon and Plutarch, who look upon the Spartan women from a different side, and represent them as worthy and homogeneous companions to the men. The Lycurgean system (as these authors describe it), considering the women as a part of the state, and not as a part of the house, placed them under training hardly less than the men. Its grand purpose, the maintenance of a vigorous breed of citizens, determined both the treatment of the younger women, and the regulations as to the intercourse of the sexes. "Female slaves are good enough (Lycurgus thought) to sit at home spinning and weaving—but who can expect a splendid offspring, the appropriate mission of <sup>the free-</sup> <sup>maid and</sup> <sup>husband,</sup> and duty of a free Spartan woman towards her country, from mothers brought up in such compulsion?"<sup>2</sup> Foremost to these views, the Spartan female underwent a bodily training analogous to that of the Spartan youth—being formally exercised, and

have taken, as the result of their greater training. We may add that their elegant domestication at that early period may well have sprung quite as much from the agency of Spartan law as from that, which

we consider what to avoid the appearance of a comparing essay, and agree with the

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, *Polit.* ii. 4. 1, 2, 3, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Xenophon, *Æop. Æop.* l. 2-4; Plutarch, *Lycurg.* c. 22-23.

contending with each other in running, wrestling, and boxing agreeably to the forms of the *Gymnasia agona*. They seem to have worn a light tunic, not open at the skirts, so as to leave the limbs both free and exposed to view—these Ptolearch speaks of them as completely uncovered, while other writers in different quarters of Greece heaped similar reproach upon the practice, as if it had been perfect nakedness.<sup>1</sup> The presence of the Spartan youths, and even of the kings and the body of citizens, at these exercises, lent earnestness to the scene. In like manner, the young women marched in the religious processions, sang and danced at particular festivals, and witnessed as spectators the exercises and exhibitions of the youths; so that the two sexes were perpetually intermingled with each other in public, in a way foreign to the habits, as well as repugnant to the feelings, of other Grecian states. We may well conceive that such an education imparted to the women both a demonstrative character and an eager interest in martial accomplishments, so that the expression of their praise was the strongest stimulus, and that of their reproach the bitterest humiliation, to the youthful troop who heard it.

The age of marriage (which in some of the unassociated cities of Greece was so early as to demonstrate visibly the breed of citizens)<sup>2</sup> was delayed by the Spartan law, both in women and men, until the period supposed to be most consistent with the perfection of the offspring. And when we read the restrictions which Sparta imposed upon the intercourse even between married persons, we shall conclude without hesitation that the public intermixture of the sexes in the way just described led to no such liberties, between persons not married, as might be likely to arise from it under other circumstances.<sup>3</sup> Marriage was almost universal among the citizens, induced by general opinion at least,

<sup>1</sup> *Strabo*, *Geograph. viii.* *Greece, Temp.* *Quæst. ii. 10.* *Thucydides* describes, as well as the great *Agona*, almost all the *Gymnasia*, where instruction was given. *Geograph. viii.* *10.*

<sup>2</sup> It is scarcely worth while to notice the partial solution of civil and domestic ties.

<sup>3</sup> How completely the practice of gymnastic and military training for young women, according to that of

the other sex, was approved by Plato, may be seen from his injunctions in his *Republic*.

<sup>4</sup> *Agæus*, *Æthi.* *vi. 14. 4.*  
<sup>5</sup> *Id.* *It is evident* *Agæus*, *Æthi.* *vi. 14. 4.* *Thucydides*, speaking of the Spartan national character, that he describes the Spartan youths, when as young as those of our society, possessed of any military power. (*History of Greece*, *vol. viii.* *vol. I. p. 101.*)

If not by law. The young Spartan married away his bride by a simulated abduction, but she still seems, for some time at least, to have continued to reside with her family, visiting her husband in his barracks in the disguise of male attire and on short and stolen moments.<sup>1</sup> To some married couples, according to Plutarch, it happened, that they had been married long enough to have two or three children, while they had scarcely seen each other apart by daylight. Secret meetings on the part of married women was unknown at Sparta; but to bring together the secret couples was regarded by the citizens as desirable, and by the lawyers as a duty. No personal feeling or jealousy on the part of the husband found sympathy from any one—and he permitted without difficulty, sometimes warmly encouraged, compliance on the part of his wife consistent with this generally acknowledged object. So far was such tolerance carried, that there were some married women who were recognised mistresses of two houses; and mothers of two distinct families,—a sort of bigamy entirely forbidden to the men, and never permitted except in the remarkable case of king Anaxandrides, when the royal Heracleidæ line of Myrtilidae was in danger of becoming extinct. The wife of Anaxandrides being childless, the ephors strongly urged him, on grounds of public necessity, to repudiate her and marry another. But he refused to divorce a wife who had given him no cause of complaint; upon which, when they found him inexorable, they desired him to retain her, but to marry another wife besides, in order that at any rate there might be issue to the Myrtilidæ line. "He then (says Herodotus) married two wives, and inhabited two family hearths, a proceeding unknown at Sparta;" yet the same privilege which, according to Xenophon, some Spartan women enjoyed without reproach from any one, and with perfect harmony between the inmates of both their houses.

<sup>1</sup> Pichler, Jerry, n. d. Example. May 1991. 4. Example from the male sex related to the difference in a genetic system. They occurred more in which it was red and white in sex. David, n. d. Example quoted. (1991) quoted the biological basis of the system.

<sup>1</sup> Example. Exp. Jan. 1-6. All 80 runs all young rats eventually got together, stayed in quadrants randomly, and never chose another group for more than one day.

met met spracher klyp, schryver de  
lyers, in andere tekenen. Het  
voldt me groten vreemde. Al te  
vrij gelyken deuren alle  
dierlyken aardige, al te klyp  
dierlyken alle met, spraken, al  
te klyp met, al te klyp met,  
met, al te klyp met, al te klyp met,

<sup>1</sup> Classified as "Secret," dated 16-09-87.  
Specimens from this date have been  
removed without documentation.



O. Müller's remarks—and the evidence, as far as we know it, bears him out—that love marriages and genuine affection towards a wife were more familiar to Sparta than to Athens; though in the former marital jealousy was a sentiment neither indulged nor recognised—while in the latter it was intense and universal.<sup>1</sup>

To resemble the careful gymnastic training, which Xenophanes and Plutarch mention, with that uncontrolled luxury and relaxation which Aristotle condemns in the Spartan women, we may perhaps suppose, that in the time of the latter the women of high position and wealth had contrived to emancipate themselves from the general obligation, and that it is of such particular cases that he chiefly speaks. He dwells especially upon the increasing tendency to accumulate property in the hands of the women,<sup>2</sup> which seems to have been still more conspicuous a century afterwards in the reign of Agis III. And we may readily imagine that one of the employments of wealth thus acquired would be to purchase exemption from laborious training,—an object more easy to accomplish in their case than in that of the men, whose services were required by the state as soldiers. If what stops so large a proportion as two-fifths of the landed property of the state came to be possessed by women, he partially explains to us. There were (he says) many sole heiresses,—the dowries given by fathers to their daughters were very large,—and the father had unlimited power of testamentary bequest, which he was disposed to use to the advantage of his daughter over his son. Perfect equality of bequest or inheritance between the two sexes, without any preference for females, would accomplish a great deal; but besides that, we are told by Aristotle that there was in the Spartan mind a peculiar sympathy and yielding disposition towards women, which he ascribes to the warlike temper both of the citizens and of the state—*Arta bearing the yoke*

<sup>1</sup> Müller, *Hist. of Greece*, iv. 4, 1. The allusion suggested by Plutarch (*Agis*, c. 10, § 2, *Κυριαὶ αὐτῶν αἰσθητικὴ καὶ ἀναισθητικὴ τῶν ἀνδρῶν*), the wife of Agis and Cleomenes, had of the wife of Plutarch (whom he does not name) an occasion of the death of their respective sons.

himself, illustrates powerfully the original unsexed character of a Spartan mother, and the devoted attachment and loyalty thus inspiring with her husband the last remnants of manliness.

<sup>2</sup> See the *Constitution of Lycurgus*, in *Oratio Rhetorica*, chap. i. § 20 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, *Agis*, c. 1.



their surviving sons in dishonour and defeat were the bitter sufferers; while those whose sons had perished maintained a bearing comparatively cheerful.<sup>1</sup>

Such were the leading points of the manly Spartan discipline, strengthened in its effect on the mind by the absence of communication with strangers. For no Spartan could go abroad without leave, nor were strangers permitted to stay at Sparta; they came thither, it seems, by a sort of sufferance, but the courteous process called *xenia*<sup>2</sup> was always available to remove them, nor could there arise in Sparta that class of restless natives or aliens who constituted a large part of the population of Athens, and seem to have been found in most other Grecian towns. It is in this universal schooling, training and drilling imposed alike upon boys and men, youths and virgins, rich and poor, that the distinctive attribute of Sparta is to be sought—not in her laws or political constitution.

Lysimachus (for the individual in whom this system is owing,

Lysimachus  
is the  
founder of  
a military  
discipline  
here, more  
than the  
founder of  
a political  
constitu-  
tion.

whenever he was) is the founder of a warlike brother-  
hood rather than the originator of a political com-  
munity; his brethren live together like bees in a  
hive (so borrow a simile from Plutarch), with all their  
feelings implanted in the commonwealth, and di-  
verted from home and house.<sup>3</sup> Far from contempla-  
ting the society as a whole, with its multifarious wants  
and liabilities, he interjects beforehand, by one of the

three primitive *Electæ*, all written laws, that is to say, all formal  
and prearranged maxims on any special subject. When dis-  
putes are to be settled or judicial interference is required, the  
magistrate is to decide from his own sense of equity: that the  
magistrate will not depart from the established customs and recog-  
nised purposes of the city, is preserved from the personal discipline

<sup>1</sup> See the remarkable account in  
Diodorus, *Biblioth.* ix. 15; Plutarch,  
*Lysimachus*, c. 10; one of the most  
striking allusions to Greek history  
concerns also the story of youths  
sent to Lacædæmonian towns, in  
Plutarch, *Life of Alcibiades*, p. 351 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch observes that Lacædæmonian  
xenia is a species of strangers  
accepted in Sparta, we may see from  
the speeches of Pericles in Thucydides

ii. 35, ii. 39. *Demetrius*, *Demetrius*,  
iii. 10, iii. 20, 4; Plutarch, *Life of*  
*Pericles*, c. 10; *Lysimachus*, c. 10; *Life of Alcibiades*,  
p. 351.

<sup>3</sup> On Sparta left the society without  
particulars; *Antiquities*, *Life of the*  
*State*, p. 100, *Demetrius*, c. 10.

<sup>4</sup> *Life of Alcibiades*, *Antiquities*,  
p. 100, *Demetrius*, c. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Plutarch, *Life of Alcibiades*, c. 10.



portion of human virtues—that which is called forth in a state of war; the citizens being converted into a sort of garrison, always under drill, and always ready to be called forth either against Helots at home or against enemies abroad. Such evidence too—may will appear less astonishing if we consider the very early and immature period at which the Lyrurgian institutions arose, when some of those generations which afterwards maintained the peace of the Hellenic world had as yet become effeminate—no constant habits of intercourse, no custom of meeting in Amphiktyony from the distant parts of Greece, no custom or largely frequented festival, no multiplication of proxenia (or standing tickets of hospitality) between the important cities, no people or individual habits anywhere. When we contemplate the general insecurity of Grecian life in the sixth or eighth century before the Christian era, and especially the precarious condition of a small band of Dorian conquerors, in Sparta and its district, with subdued Helots on their own lands and Achæans warlike all around them—we shall not be surprised that the language which Brasidas in the Peloponnesian war addressed to his army in reference to the original Spartan settlement, was still more powerfully present to the mind of Lyrurgus four centuries earlier—"We are a few in the midst of many enemies; we can only maintain ourselves by fighting and conquering!"

Under such circumstances, the exclusive aim which Lyrurgus proposed to himself is easily understood; but what is truly surprising, is the violence of his means, and the success of the result. He realized his project of creating in the 8000 or 9000 Spartan citizens un-civilized habits of obedience, hardihood, self-denial, and military aptitude—complete subjection on the part of each individual to the local public opinion, and preference of death to the abandonment of Spartan maxims—intense ambition on the part of every one to distinguish himself within the prescribed sphere of duties, with little ambition for anything else. In what

He had  
exclusively  
aimed—  
the means  
employed  
were.

<sup>1</sup> *Archiep. Poll. ii. 2. 37; iii. 14. 15; viii. 1. 5; viii. 1. 1. Thuc. Legg. 2. p. 631-632. Plutarch. Solon. c. 10.*

<sup>2</sup> *Plutarch. ii. 126.* "Of us only the Spartan conquer lives, for all, all equal before death, like gladiators put to the trial;" and many other words.

and the character of of Spartan society.

The most remarkable circumstance is, that these words are addressed by Brasidas to an army composed in large proportion of Spartanized Helots (Plutarch. ii. 124).

matter so rigorous a system of individual training can have been first brought to bear upon any community, mastering the means of the struggle and attains from boyhood to old age—a work far more difficult than any political revolution—we are not permitted to discuss. Nor does even the influence of an earnest and energetic Herakleian man—assisted by the still more powerful working of the Delphian god behind, upon the strong pure receptivability of the Spartan mind—sufficiently explain a phenomenon so remarkable in the history of mankind, unless we suppose them aided by some combination of co-operating circumstances which history has not transmitted to us,<sup>1</sup> and preceded by discipline as suggested as to render the citizens glad to escape from them at any price.

Regarding the ante-Lycurgean Sparta we possess no positive information whatever. But although this unfortunate gap cannot be filled up, we may yet master the negative probabilities of the case sufficiently to see that in what Plutarch has told us (and from Plutarch the modern views here, until lately, have derived), there is indeed a base of reality, but there is also a large superstructure of romance,—not a few particulars essentially misleading. For example, Plutarch treats Lycurgus as introducing his reforms at a time when Sparta was mistress of Laconia, and distributing the whole of that territory among the Perioeci. Now we know that Laconia was not then in possession of Sparta, and that the partition of Lycurgus (assuming it to be real) could only have been applied to the land in the immediate vicinity of the latter. For even Amyklæ, Fluviæ, and Gerontion were not conquered until the reign of Theopompus, posterior to any period which we can reasonably assign to Lycurgus: nor can any such distribution of Laconia have really occurred. Further we are told that Lycurgus banished from Sparta coined gold and silver, useless professions and idleness, eager pursuit of gain, and ostentatious display. Without dwelling upon the improbability that any one of these anti-Spartan characteristics should have existed at so early a period as the sixth century before the Christian era, we may at least be certain that coined silver was not then to be found, since

impossibility  
of Plutarch  
about  
Lycurgus  
—which  
remains  
in them.

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch knows the system of Lycurgus, and Lycurgus as his missionary (Lapp. 1. p. 487), as concluding from the Delphian Apollo.

It was first introduced into Greece by Phidias of Argos in the preceding century, as has been stated in the preceding section.

But amongst all the points stated by Plutarch, the most suspicious by far, and the most misleading, because endless calculations have been built upon it, is the alleged redistribution of landed property. He tells us that Lykurgos found fearful inequality in the landed possessions of the Spartans; nearly all the land in the hands of a few, and a great multitude without any land; that he rectified this evil by a redistribution of the Spartan domain into 9000 equal lots, and the rest of Lacedæmonia into 20,000, giving to each citizen as much as would produce a given quota of barley, &c.; and that he wished moreover to have divided the movable property upon similar principles of equality, but was deterred by the difficulties of carrying his design into execution.

Now we shall find on consideration that this new and equal partition of lands by Lykurgos is still more at variance with fact and probability than the two former alleged proceedings. All the historical evidences exhibit decided inequalities of property among the Spartans—inequalities which lasted constantly to the end; moreover, the earlier authors do not conceive this evil as having grown up by way of decay out of a primordial system of perfect equality, nor do they know anything of the original equal redistribution by Lykurgos. Even as early as the poet Alkman (B.C. 600–580) we find bitter complaints of the oppressive ascendancy of wealth, and the degradation of the poor man, cited as having been pronounced by Aristodemus at Sparta: "Wealth (and he) makes the man—no poor person is either accounted good or honored!" Next, the historian Hæcæteus certainly knew nothing of the Lykurgian redistribution—for he ascribed the whole Spartan policy to Rægyseus and Phidias, the original founders, and hardly noticed Lykurgos at all. Again, in the brief but impressive description of the Spartan lawgiver by Herodotus, several other institutions are alluded

<sup>1</sup> *Alcibiades Fragment*, 26, p. 26, ed. *Thilo—Kühner's* *Antiquities of Sparta*, &c.

<sup>2</sup> *See the Hæcæteus' description of the Spartan lawgiver in the School of Plutarch's *Antiquities of Sparta*, &c.*









(without ground I think) that it was forbidden to divide them, because insufficient for numerous families, and were to have been alienated in some restricted manner to the rich? While every industrious citizen being both interested in a Spartan citizen and really inconsistent with his rigorous personal discipline, no other means of furnishing his quota, except the lot of land, was open to him. The difficulty felt with regard to these smaller lots of land may be judged of from the fact stated by Polybius,<sup>1</sup>

that three or four Spartan brothers had often one and the same wife, the paternal land being just sufficient to furnish contributions for all to the public mace, and thus to keep alive the citizen-right of all the sons. The tendency to disinclination in the number of Spartan citizens seems to have gone on uninterruptedly from the time of the Persian war, and must have been aggravated by the destruction of Mantineæ, with its independent territory secured, after the battle of Leuctra, as events which robbed the Spartans of a large portion of their property. Apart from these special causes, moreover, it has been observed often as a statistical fact, that a close corporation of citizens, or any small number of families, intermarrying habitually among one another, and not reinforced from without, have usually a tendency to diminish.

The present is not the occasion to enter at length into the combination of causes which partly sapped, partly overthrew, both the institutions of Lycurgus and the power of Sparta. But

Plutarch, vol. v. p. 77, Wyttch. 1. But Plutarch does not lay down this as a necessity of an oligarchical state; he merely says that a man is better off when he has only one son (Comp. vol. viii. c. 12) and M. Peller has been able to illustrate as an authority for Spartan customs of an hereditary number of citizens under no laws, which he sets forth in his treatise *De Legibus* p. 140. It is highly probable that he would have done so, still had not Aristotle have suggested that Lycurgus or the Spartan laws were either revealed, or intended to secure, the maintenance of an unchangeable number of citizens, corresponding law for the necessary number that citizens as a probability of maintaining the Constitution, in his laws for the Thebans (*Politic.* ii. 4, 5).

<sup>1</sup> Polybius, Plutarch, in: *Mal. Gort.* York, 1849. vol. ii. p. 336.

Perhaps, as O. Müller remarks this may mean only, that even though the strictest law had given to every man the privilege of the franchise in regard to marriage, even in many other points in different laws, that state oligarchy continued to secure the small permanent citizenry of the Spartans, vol. ii. c. 12—which indeed is both illustrated and supported graphically by the population granted in the laws of Solon to an individual man and then divided in marriage by a relative in his old age—in 1 couple and repeat again with the same effect at Plutarch, in: *De Legibus* p. 140. It is probable that the property of these families diminished, vol. ii. c. 12.

I may observe, that of O. Müller's observations regarding the law of birth at Sparta, several are unsupported and some incorrect.

taking the condition of that city as it stood in the time of Agis III. (ay about 380 B.C.), we know that its citizens had become few in number, the bulk of them miserably poor, and all the land in a small number of hands. The old discipline and the public mass (so far as the rich were concerned) had degenerated into mere forms—a numerous body of strangers or non-citizens (the old meeting, or prohibition of resident strangers, being long discontinued) was dissolved in the towns, forming a powerful moneyed interest; and lastly, the dignity and ascendancy of the state amongst its neighbours were altogether ruined.

It was impossible to a young enthusiast like King Agis, as well as to many ardent spirits among his contemporaries, to content this degeneration with the previous glories of their country; nor did they see any other way of reconstituting the old Sparta except by again admitting the disfranchised poor citizens, restoring the lands, cancelling all debts, and restoring the public mass and military training in all their strictness. Agis endeavoured to carry through these subversive measures (such as no demagogue in the extreme democracy of Athens would ever have ventured to glance at), with the consent of the senate and public assembly, and the acquiescence of the rich. His sincerity is attested by the fact, that his own property, and that of his female relatives, among the largest in the state, was cast as the first sacrifice into the common stock. But he became the victim of unprincipled envy, and perished in the overwhelming attempt to realise his scheme by persuasion. His successor Kleomenes afterwards accomplished by violence changes substantially similar, though the interruption of foreign arms speedily overthrew both himself and his institutions.

Now it was under the state of public feeling which gave birth to these projects of Agis and Kleomenes at Sparta, that the historic story, unknown to Aristotle and his predecessors, first gained ground, of the absolute equality of property as a primitive institution of Lycurgus. How much such a belief would favour the schemes of innovation is too obvious to require notice; and without supposing any deliberate imposture, we cannot be astonished that the prepossessions of enthusiastic patriots

Disfranchised  
number of  
citizens and  
degeneration  
of Sparta in  
the time of  
Agis. The  
public mass  
is reduced  
the dignity  
of the state.

History  
story of  
Lycurgus  
as an equal  
partitioner  
of lands  
given out  
at the  
meeting.

interpreted according to their own partialities in old unrecorded legislation from which they were separated by more than five centuries. The Lykurgian discipline tended steadily to support in men's minds the idea of equality among the citizens,—that is, the negation of all inequality not founded on some personal attribute,—disregard as it reflected the habits, enjoyments, and capacities of the rich to those of the poor; and the inequality then existing in idea and tendency, which seemed to proclaim the wish of the founder, was striketh by the later reformers into a positive restriction which he had at first realized, but from which his desperate followers had recoiled. It was thus that the fables, legends, and indirect suggestions of the present assumed the character of recollections out of the early, obscure, and distant historical past. Perhaps the philosopher Ephorus of Erythraea (friend and companion of Kleomenes,<sup>1</sup> disciple of Zeno the Stoic, and author of works now lost both on Lykurgos and Solon and on the constitution of Sparta) may have been one of those who gave currency to such an hypothesis. And we shall readily believe that, if advanced, it would find very and almost universal, when we recollect how many similar delusions have obtained vogue in modern times for more favorable to historical accuracy—how much false coloring has been attached by the political feeling of recent days to matters of ancient history, such as the Roman Widespreadness, the Great Charter, the rise and growth of the English House of Commons, or even the Poor Law of Elizabeth.

When we read the division of lands really proposed by King Agis, it is found to be a very close copy of the original division.

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, Kleomenes, cap. 5-12, with the note of Leake, p. 199; also Leake, cap. 5; Leake, p. 191.

Ephorus also discussed the constitution of Kleomenes, especially with regard to the law of the Lykurgos, Agis, &c.

Phylarchus followed Ephorus and introduced many of his ideas into his history, especially in the account of Sparta and Kleomenes. He also introduced many of his ideas into his history, especially in the account of Sparta and Kleomenes. He also introduced many of his ideas into his history, especially in the account of Sparta and Kleomenes.

of his own suggestions. He, however, followed Ephorus, and introduced many of his ideas into his history, especially in the account of Sparta and Kleomenes. He also introduced many of his ideas into his history, especially in the account of Sparta and Kleomenes.

The account of Ephorus is also followed by many of the writers of the time, especially in the account of Sparta and Kleomenes. He also introduced many of his ideas into his history, especially in the account of Sparta and Kleomenes.

applied to Lykurgos. He parcels the lands bounded by the four limits of Pelopon, Solfonia, Siklos, and Tappetra, into 4800 lots, one to every Spartan; and the lands beyond these limits into 18,000 lots, one to each Perianthus; and he proposes to constitute in Sparta fifteen *Phoridias* or public manufactories, some including 400 individuals, others 300,—thus providing a place for each of his 4800 Spartans. With respect to the division originally awarded to Lykurgos, different accounts were given. Some considered it to have set out 8000 lots for the district of Sparta, and 30,000 for the rest of Laconia;<sup>1</sup> others affirmed that 8000 lots had been given by Lykurgos, and 3000 added afterwards by king Polydorus; a third tale was, that Lykurgos had assigned 4800 lots, and king Polydorus as many more. This last scheme is much the same as what was really proposed by Agis.

In the preceding argument respecting the reform of land applied to Lykurgos, I have taken that account as it is described by Plutarch. But there has been a tendency, in some able modern writers, while admitting the general fact of such redresses, to reject the account given by Plutarch in some of its more circumstances. That, for instance, which is the capital feature in Plutarch's narrative, and which gives soul and meaning to his picture of the lawgiver—the equality of partition—is now rejected by many as incorrect, and it is supposed that Lykurgos made some new Spartan regulations tending towards a general equality of landed property, but not an entirely new partition; that he may have resumed from the wealthy men lands which they had unjustly taken from the conquered Achæans, and thus provided allotments both for the poorer citizens and for the subject Læconians. Such is the opinion of Dr. Thirlwall, who at the same time admits that the exact proportion of the Lykurgian distribution can hardly be ascertained.<sup>2</sup>

Opinion that Lykurgos proposed to divide the whole of the Pelopon into 48,000 lots, one to each Spartan, and 18,000 to each Perianthus.

<sup>1</sup> Describing Lykurgos, see Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, c. 2. *Plutarch*, l. 2. c. 2. *Plutarch*, l. 2. c. 2. *Plutarch*, l. 2. c. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. of Greece*, ed. 2. vol. 2. p. 334-335.

C. F. Thirlwall, on the contrary, considers the equal partition of lands, not less impracticable and unjust than the "as regards condition" (see *Plutarch's* description) of the whole Lykurgian system (see *Plutarch's* description).



It appears to me that these illustrations are best obtained by adopting a different canon of historical interpretation. We cannot accept as real the Lycurgus land division described in the life of the lawgiver; but treating that account as a fiction, two modes of proceeding are open to us. We may either consider the fiction, as it now stands, to be the suggestion and distortion of some small fact, and then try to guess, without any assistance, what the small fact was; or we may regard it as fiction from first to last, the expression of some large idea and sentiment as powerful in its action on men's minds at a given time, as to induce them to make a place for it among the realities of the past. Now the latter suggestion, applied to the times of Agesilaus, best meets the case before us. The eighth chapter of the life of Lycurgus by Plutarch, in recounting the partition of land, describes the dream of King Agesilaus, whose land is full of two sentiments—pride and shame for the actual condition of his country, together with reverence for its past glories as well as for the lawgiver from whose institutions those glories had descended. Absorbed with this double feeling, the wishes of Agesilaus go back to the old ante-Lycurgus Sparta as it stood more than five centuries before. He sees in the spot the same markets and disorders as those which offend his waking eye—gross inequalities of property, with a few insolent and luxurious rich, a crowd of antiseptic and suffering poor, and nothing but fierce antipathy reigning between the two. Into the midst of this disorder, lawless, and disappointed community steps the venerable missionary from Delphi,—breathes into men's minds new impulses, and so impetuously to shake off the old social and political Adam—and persuades the rich, voluntarily relinquishing their temporal advantages, to welcome with satisfaction a new system wherein no distinction shall be recognized, except that of good or evil desert.<sup>1</sup> Having thus regenerated the national mind, he parades out the territory of Laconia into equal lots, leaving as imperatively to any man. Internal harmony becomes the overriding sentiment, while the coming harvest pro-

This study  
report of  
17 patients  
is here  
explained  
by compar-  
ing it with  
other and  
new cases of  
SARS.

† *Phytolacca*, *Euphorbia* & *R. canadensis* are present between all seven rivers, but *Lythrum hyssarifolium*, and the rare *Asclepias tuberosa*, *Ipomoea* and *Scrophularia* only occur occasionally in the southern half.

paradigma: de către țigari este foarte  
 este foarte important, și  
 este foarte important, și  
 este foarte important, și  
 este foarte important, și





The various items in that story all hang together, and must be understood as forming parts of the same comprehensive fact, or comprehensive 'hoax.' The fixed total of 8000 Spartans and 80,000 Lacedæmon lots,<sup>1</sup> the equality between them, and the rise accruing from such, represented by a given quantity of moist and dry produce,—all these particulars are alike true or alike unverified. Upon the various numbers here given, many authors have raised calculations as to the population and produce of Lacedæmon, which appear to me destitute of any trustworthy foundation. Those who accept the history, that Lycurgus constituted the above-mentioned numbers both of citizens and of lots of land, and that he contemplated the maintenance of both numbers in interchangeable proportion, are perplexed to assign the means whereby this adjustment was kept undisturbed. Nor are they much assisted in the solution of this embarrassing problem by the statement of Plutarch, who tells us that the number remained fixed of itself, and that the succession ran on from father to son without either coarctation or multiplication of persons, down to the period when foreign wealth flowed into Sparta, as a consequence of the successful conclusion of the Peloponnesian war. Shortly after that period (he tells us) a citizen named Epitadeus became angry—a vindictive and malignant man, who, having had a quarrel with his son, and wishing to cast him from the Spartan succession, introduced and obtained sanction to a new *Electio*, whereby power was granted to every father Epitadeus of a family either to make over during life, or to bequeath

Admiration  
induced  
diffusion  
of moist  
standing by  
the fact  
which the  
moisture and  
temperature  
of the  
land was  
maintained.

Many think  
the story  
was  
Epitadeus.

constitution of Sparta, which I think either untrue or unverified. There was no failure in the inheritance as well as in the constitution of the present lots of land—which I believe to be lost to this extent on that point.

Plutarch is the thinker that I have just been for to identify every family. He thinks that Epitadeus either here does something, which much more than what is offered, but he is under equally if not more

Plutarch's opinion that Sparta was perfect. If we had other evidence, perhaps such facts might appear. And as the

evidence clearly are there is nothing whatever in that fact. But are we entitled to say that the power was given to the father to make over or to bequeath, while the number of citizens was in force of that law that was lost. In Plutarch's story it is the father of Epitadeus, and not Epitadeus of Sparta, but the latter seems better supported by this, and most probable.

Plutarch from it is to suppose that the fathers of the Spartans might make over land to their sons and to other families, while the number of citizens was in force of that law that was lost. In Plutarch's story it is the father of Epitadeus, and not Epitadeus of Sparta, but the latter seems better supported by this, and most probable.

after death, his house and his estate to any one whom he chose.<sup>1</sup> But it is plain that this story (whatever be the truth about the family quarrel of Epitadeus) does not help us out of the difficulty. From the time of Leiburgus to that of this disabussing sphere, more than four centuries must be reckoned: how had there been real causes at work sufficient to maintain intimate the blooded number of lots and families during this long period, we see no reason why his new law, simply partisans and nothing more, should have overthrown it. We are not told by Plutarch what was the law of succession prior to Epitadeus. If the whole estate went by law to one son in the family, what became of the other sons, to whom industrious acquisition in any shape was repulsive as well as interdicted? If, on the other hand, the estate was divided between the sons equally (as it was by the law of succession at Athens), how can we defend the maintenance of an unchanged aggregate number of persons?

In Thirlwall, after having admitted a qualified interference with private property by Leiburgus, so as to avert from the country a certain sacrifice in order to create lots for the poor, and to bring about something approaching to equal-producing lots for all, observes:—"The average amount of the rent (paid by the cultivating Hekots from each lot) seems to have been no more than was required for the frugal maintenance of a family with six persons. The right of transfer was as strictly confined as that of enjoyment: the patrimony was indivisible, inalienable, and descended to the eldest son; in default of a male heir, to the eldest daughter. The object seems to have been, after the number of the citizens became fixed, that each should be constantly represented by one head of a household. But the nature of the means employed for this end is one of the most obscure points of the Spartan system. . . . In the better times of the commonwealth, this seems to have been principally effected by adoptions and marriages with foreigners, which provided for the marriages of younger sons in families too numerous to be supported on their own hereditary property. It was then probably useless, necessary for the state to interfere, in order to direct the children of one estate, or the father of a son

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *Agh.* 4. 4.

believe, to a proper choice. But as all adoption required the sanction of the kings, and they had also the disposal of the herd of orphan heifers, there can be little doubt that the magistrates had the power of interfering in such cases, even in opposition to the wishes of individuals, to relieve poverty and check the accumulation of wealth." (*Hist. Gr.*, ch. 8, vol. i., p. 397.)

I cannot concur in the view which Dr. Thirlwall here takes of the state of property, or the arrangements respecting its transmission, in ancient Sparta. Neither the equal equality of possession which he supposes, nor the precautions for perpetuating it, can be shown to have ever existed among the people of Lacedæmon.

Landed property was always unequally divided at Sparta.

Our earliest information intimates the existence of rich men at Sparta: the story of king Arius and Agis, in Herodotus, exhibits to us the latter as a man who cannot be supposed to have had only just "enough to maintain six persons frugally"—while his beautiful wife, whom Arius coveted and snatched from him, is expressly described as the daughter of opulent parents Spithidis and Dialis the Talthyriads are designated as belonging to a distinguished man, and among the wealthiest men in Sparta. Demaratus was the only king of Sparta, in the days of Herodotus, who had ever gained a chariot victory in the Olympic games; but we know by the case of Laches during the Peloponnesian war, Brasidas, and others, that private Spartans were equally successful; and for one Spartan who won the prize, there must of course have been many who bred their horses and started their chariots unsuccessfully. It need hardly be remarked that chariot-competition at Olympia was one of the most significant evidences of a wealthy house: nor were these wealthy Spartans who kept horses and dogs without any exclusive view to the games. We know from Xenophon, that at the time of the battle of Leuctra, "the very rich Spartans" provided the horses to be mounted for the state-cavalry.<sup>1</sup> These and other proofs, of the existence of rich men at Sparta, are inconsistent with the idea of a body of citizens each possessing what was about enough for the frugal maintenance of six persons and no more.

<sup>1</sup> Herod. vi. 61. *See* *Antiquities* of Major Agard, ch. i. vol. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Herod. vi. 77-103; Thucyd. i. 88.

<sup>3</sup> Xenophon, *Hellen.* vi. 4. 11. Xenophon *de Equis*, lib. i. c. 1; *Memor.* vi. 1. 1. Thucyd. vi. 16. 1.

As we do not find that such was in practice the state of property in the Spartan community, so neither can we discover that the lawgiver ever tried either to make or to keep it so.

What he did was to impose a rigorous public discipline, with simple clothing and hair, incontinent diet upon the rich and the poor (this was his special present to Greece, according to Theophrastus,<sup>1</sup> and his great point of contact with democracy, according to Aristotle); but he took no pains either to restrain the enrichment of the former, or to prevent the impoverishment of the latter. He meddled little with the distribution of property, and took no part in one of the capital differences for which Aristotle censures him. That philosopher tells us, indeed, that the Spartans law had made it dishonourable (he does not say, presumptuously forbidden) to buy or sell landed property, but that there was the fellow Hellas both of donation and bequest: and the same result (he justly observes) ensued from the practice tolerated as would have ensued from the practice discontinued—since it was easy to disguise a real sale under an ostensible donation. He notices pointedly the tendency of property at Sparta to concentrate itself in fewer hands, unopposed by any legal hindrance: the fathers married their daughters to whomsoever they chose, and gave dowries according to their own discretion, generally very large: the rich families moreover intermarried *amongst* *among* one another habitually and without restriction. Now all these are indicated by Aristotle as cases in which the law might have interfered, and ought to have interfered, but did not—for the great purpose of demonstrating the benefits of landed property as much as possible among the mass of the citizens. Again, he tells us that the law encouraged the multiplication of property, and granted exemptions to such citizens as had three or four children—but took no thought how the numerous families of poorer citizens were to live, or to maintain their qualification at the public tables, most of the lands of the state being in the hands of the rich.<sup>2</sup> His notice, and condemnation of that law, which made the freedom of the

<sup>1</sup> Theophr. l. c.; Aristotle, *Polit.* iv. 1. <sup>2</sup> Aristotle, *Polit.* ii. 4, iv. 11, v. 4, 6, 8, vii. 1, 2.















as anything. Nor can we tell what principles the Dorian conquerors may have followed in the original allotment of lands within the limits of that province. Equal apportionment is not probable, because all the individuals of a conquering band are seldom regarded as possessing equal claims; but whatever the original apportionment may have been, it remained without any general or several disturbance until the days of Ages III. and Kleomenes III. Here then we have the primitive Sparta, including Dorian warriors with their Helot subjects, but no Perioikoi. And it is upon these Spartans separately, perhaps after the period of aggravated disorder and lawlessness noticed by Herodotus and Thucydides, that the painted but unperforated discipline above sketched must have been originally brought to bear.

Original  
Dorian  
allotment of  
land in  
Sparta  
entirely  
probably  
not equal.

The gradual conquest of Laconia, with the acquisition of additional lands and new Helots, and the formation of the order of Perioikoi, both of which were a consequence of it—so to be considered as posterior to the introduction of the Lykurgian system at Sparta, and as resulting partly from the increased form which that system imposed. The career of conquest went on, beginning from Tisakhos, for nearly three centuries—with some interruptions indeed, and in the case of the Messenian war, with a desperate and even protracted struggle—so that in the time of Thucydides, and for some time previously, the Spartans possessed two-fifths of Peloponnesus. And this series of new acquisitions and victories dispensed the really weak point of the Spartan system, by excluding a possible cause to plant the poorer citizens as Perioikoi in a conquered township, or to supply them with lots of land, of which they could receive the produce without leaving the city—so that their numbers and their military strength were prevented from declining. It is even affirmed by Aristotle, that during these early times they augmented the number of their citizens by fresh admissions, which of course implies the acquisition of additional lots of land.<sup>1</sup> But successful war (so we use an expression substantially borrowed from the same philosopher) was necessary to their salvation; the establishment

Gradual  
conquest of  
Laconia,  
the result of  
the law  
enacted  
by the  
Lykurgian  
reformation.

<sup>1</sup> *ARISTOTELIS POLITICA*, II. 2, 32.





among the cities of the Perioeci as one of the hundred ;<sup>1</sup> the distinction between a dependent city and a village not being very strictly drawn. The festival of the Hyacinthia, celebrated at the great temple of the Argivean Apollo, was among the most solemn and venerated in the Spartan calendar.

It was in the time of Alcibiades the son of Timotheus that the Spartans conquered Helos, a maritime town on the left bank of the Saronic, and reduced its inhabitants to bondage—from whose names,<sup>2</sup> according to various authors, the general title *Heloi*, belonging to all the souls of Laconia, was derived. But of the conquest of the other towns of Laconia—Orethion, Alaris, Therapsa, &c.—or of the western land on the coast of the Argolic Gulf, including Breaux and Epidermus Limnes, or the island of Kythira, all which at one time belonged to the Argivean confederacy, we have no accounts.

Scanty as our information is, it just enables us to make out a progressive increase of lawe and dominion on the part of the Spartans, resulting from the organization of Lycurgus. Of this progress a further manifestation is found, besides the conquest of the Achæans in the south by Timotheus and Alcibiades, in their successful opposition to the great power of Pisistratus the Argivean, related in a previous chapter. We now approach the long and arduous efforts by which they accomplished the subjugation of their brethren the Messenian Dæmon.

<sup>1</sup> *Strabo*, *Geogr.* iv. i. 11.

<sup>2</sup> *Plutarch*, *de Exil.* c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

<sup>3</sup> It is to be here for Pisistratus stated that the Argivean called Helos to control.

Early institutions were probably have been given by our, perhaps from the ancient Lycurgus, or Pisistratus, which were formed part of the Argivean confederacy.

## CHAPTER VII.

## FIRST AND SECOND MESSENIAN WARS.

THAT there were two long contests between the Lacedæmonians and Messenians, and that, in both, the former were completely victorious, is a fact sufficiently attested. And if we could trust the statements in Pausanias—our chief and almost only authority on the subject—we should be in a situation to reconstruct the history of both these wars in considerable detail. But unfortunately the incidents recorded in that writer have been gathered from sources which are, even by his own admission, undeserving of credit—from Rhinias, the poet of Elai in Elis, who had composed an epic poem on Aristomenes and the second Messenian war, about B.C. 180—and from Myrta of Fritoli, a prose author whose date is not exactly known, but belonging to the Alexandrine age, and not earlier than the third century before the Christian era. From Rhinias we have no right to expect trustworthy information, while the accuracy of Myrta is much depreciated by Pausanias himself—on some points even too much, as will presently be shown. But apart from the mental habits either of the prose writer or the poet, it does not seem that any good means of knowledge were open to either of them, except the poems of Tyrtæus, which we are by no means sure that they ever consulted. The account of the two wars, extracted from these two authors by Pausanias, is a string of tallies, several of them indeed highly poetical, but destitute of historical coherence or sufficiency; and O. Müller has justly observed, that “absolutely no reason is given us them for the subjection of Messenia.”<sup>1</sup> They are accurate

<sup>1</sup> *History of the Romans*, i. 2, 18. In considerable detail, if we may judge  
 correct. It seems that Pausanias had from a fragment of the last century  
 great a history of the Messenian wars that, including the details between



merely of being transcribed in detail into the pages of general history, nor can we pretend to do anything more than verify a few leading facts of the war.

The poet Tyrtæus was himself engaged on the side of the Spartans in the second war, and it is from him that we learn the few reliable facts respecting both the first and the second. If the Messenians had never been re-established in Peloponnesus, we should probably never have heard any further details respecting these early contests. That re-establishment, together with the first foundation of the city called Meneleæ on Mount Ithakæ, was among the capital wounds inflicted on Sparta by Epaminondas, in the year B.C. 369—between 300 and 350 years after the conclusion of the second Messenian war. The descendants of the old Messenians, who had remained for so long a period without any fixed position in Greece, were incorporated in the new city, together with various Helots and miscellaneous settlers who had no claim to a similar genealogy. The gods and heroes of the Messenian race were reverentially invoked at this great ceremony, especially the great hero Aristomachus;<sup>1</sup> and the sight of Mount Ithakæ, the asylum of the newly established citizens, the hatred and apprehension of Sparta, operating as a powerful stimulus to the creation and multiplication of what are called traditions, sufficed to expand the few facts known respecting the struggles of

chiefly  
having to  
the city  
after the  
foundation  
of Messene  
by Epaminondas.

the old Messenians into a variety of details. In almost all these stories we discover a coloring unfavorable to Sparta, contrasting decidedly with the account given by Æschylus in his *Dæmones* called *Archidæmons*, whence we read the view which a Spartan might take of the ancient conquests of his forefathers. But a clear proof that these Messenian stories had no real basis of tradition is shown in the contradictory statements respecting the principal hero Aristomachus; for some place him in the first, others in the second, of the two wars. *Stoddens* and *Mytilæ* both placed him in the first; *Eubœus* in the second. Though

<sup>1</sup> *Stoddens* and *Aristomachus*. Very probably a war taken from *Epaminondas*—though this we do not know.

<sup>2</sup> For the antiquity of traditions respecting *Mytilæ* and *Stoddens*, see in *5. Epaminondas* *Mytilæ* and *Eubœus*; *Revised*, he seems to have received

and statements from contemporary traditions and contemporaries; it lived in some versions in *Stoddens* and *Mytilæ* the two contradictory stories *St. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.*

<sup>3</sup> *Stoddens* in *St. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.* *Revised*, in *St. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.*



(speaking during the second war), "the fathers of our fathers conquered Elisalis"; thus loosely indicating the relative date of the war.

The Spartans (as we learn from *Isokrates*, whose words date from a time when the city of Elisalis was only a recent foundation) professed to have seized the territory, partly in revenge for the impiety of the Messenians in killing their own king the Herakleid *Krotophontes*, whose relative had appealed to Sparta for aid—partly by sentence of the Delphian oracles. Such were the causes which had induced them first to invade the country, and they had conquered it after a struggle of twenty years.<sup>1</sup> The Lacedæmonian explanations, as given in *Thucydides*, seem for the most part to be counter-statements arranged after the time when the Messenian version, evidently the interesting and popular account, had become circulated.

It has already been stated that the Lacedæmonians and Messenians had a joint border temple and sacrifice in honour of Artemis Elisalis, dating from the earliest times of their establishment in Peloponnesus. The site of this temple near the upper source of the river Neda, in the mountainous territory north-east of Elisalis, but west of the highest ridge of Taygetos, has recently been exactly verified—and it seems in these early days to have belonged to Sparta. That the quarrel began at one of these border sacrifices was the statement of both parties, Lacedæmonians and Messenians. According to *Herodotus*, the Lacedæmonian King *Telichos* laid a snare for the Messenians, by dressing up some youthful Spartans as virgins and giving them daggers; whereupon a contest ensued, in which the Spartans were worsted, and *Telichos* slain. That *Telichos* was slain at the temple by the Messenians was also the account of the Spartans; but they affirmed that he was slain in attempting to defend some young Lacedæmonian maidens, who were sacrificing at the temple, against outrageous violence from the Messenian youth.<sup>2</sup>

he cited as a witness to prove that Elisalis did not lay during the war Elisalis was, which is the purpose for which *Thucydides* quotes him (ii. 41).

<sup>1</sup> *Isokrates* (Lacedæmon, de el. p. 225-226).

<sup>2</sup> *Herodotus* (ii. p. 270) gives a striking account of the sacrifice and war, and mentions the Messenian youth at the temple of Artemis Elisalis. The version, substantially agreeing with that of the Lacedæmonians, seems to be borrowed from Elisalis the



the first four years of the war the Lacedæmonians made no progress, and even incurred the rebuke of the old men of their nation as faint-hearted warriors. In the fifth year, however, they undertook a most vigorous invasion, under their two kings, Theopompus and Polydorus, who were met by Egeus with the full force of the Messenians. A desperate battle ensued, in which it does not seem that either side gained much advantage: nevertheless the Messenians found themselves so much infatigued by it, that they were forced to take refuge on the fortified mountains of Ithakæ, abandoning the rest of the country. In

*Messians  
kings  
Egeus  
and Aristo-  
dorus.*

their distress they sent to solicit counsel and protection from Delphi, but their messengers brought back the appalling answer that a virgin of the royal race of Mycenæ must be sacrificed for their salvation. At

the tragic scene which ensues, Aristodorus puts to death his own daughter, yet without satisfying the oracles of the oracle. The war still continued, and in the sixteenth year of it another hard-fought battle took place, in which the brave Egeus was slain, but the result was again indecisive. Aristodorus, being elected king in his place, prosecuted the war strenuously. The fifth year of his reign is equaled by a third general battle, wherein the Corinthians aided the Spartans, and the Arcadians and Sikyonians are on the side of Messenians; the victory is here decisive on the side of Aristodorus, and the Lacedæmonians are driven back into their own territory.<sup>1</sup> It was now their turn to

*Corinthians  
Arcadians  
Sikyonians  
on behalf  
of the  
Messians—  
after a  
very long  
they are  
completely  
overcome.*

send envoys and ask advice from the Delphic oracle. The remaining events of the war exhibit a series, partly of stratagems to fulfil the injunctions of the priestess,—partly of prodigies in which the divine wrath is manifested against the Messenians. The king Aristodorus, agonised with the thought that he has slain his own daughter without saving his country, puts an end to his own life.<sup>2</sup> In the twentieth year of the war the Messenians abandoned Ithakæ, which the Lacedæmonians

<sup>1</sup> It is perhaps in this narrative that the story of the Spartans in their progress passed into Athens, cf. p. 170. These changed into the story of the Spartans who had been slain in the war and who were subsequently resurrected.

The story of the Perikles, off-sets and explains it, as it is, belongs to the tradition of the story of Perikles or Perikles (cf. p. 170).

<sup>2</sup> See Pausanias, *de Spartanis*, p. 100.

road to the ground: the rest of the country being speedily recovered, each of the ministers as did not see either to Arrada or to Elende were refused to complete submission.

Such is the abridgement of what Francisco<sup>1</sup> gives as the narrative of the first Macedonian war. Most of his details bear the evident stamp of mere late revision; and it will easily be seen that the sequence of events presents no plausible explanation of that which is really indubitable—the result. The twenty years' war and the final abandonment of Illyria is attested by Tyrtæus beyond all doubt, as well as the harsh treatment of the conquered—"Like waves were down by heavy barthena;" says the Spartan poet, "they were compelled to make over to their masters an entire half of the produce of their fields, and to come in the garb of woe to Sparta, themselves and their wives, as mourners at the decease of the kings and principal persons". The result of their despoliation, against a pole so oppressive, goes by the name of the second Macedonian war.

Had we possessed the account of the first Macedonian war as given by Myrtil and Diolira, it would evidently have been very different from the above, because they included Africa in it, and to him the leading parts would be assigned. As the narrative now stands in Francisco, we are not introduced to that great Macedonian hero—the Achilles of the Epic of Elende<sup>2</sup>—until the second war, in which his gigantic proportions stand prominently forward. He is the great champion of his country in the three battles which are represented as taking place during this war: the first, with indecisive result, at Dene; the second, a signal victory on the part of the Macedonians, at the Beach Grove; the third, an equally signal defeat, in conse-

<sup>1</sup> See *Francisco*, p. 6-24.

An interesting circumstance is to be found in Meador's *Spoken*, in the introduction where Francisco has believed in his *History of the Macedonian Wars*, II. *Spoken*, vol. I, p. 74.

It would evidently be to the advantage, p. 241 to suppose that in the history of the Macedonian wars, as Francisco has been before us, we possess the true history of these events.

<sup>2</sup> Tyrtæus, *Frags.* 1, 2, *Odyssey* *what*.

Of H. Francisco according the total result of the Macedonian after the first war as well as comparison with what is known after the second (Tyrtæus *for Odessa*, *Spoken*, vol. I, p. 74, a comparison with the complete words of Tyrtæus under similar title.

It is in the express comparison introduced by Francisco, II. 1, 2.

Francisco  
and  
Tyrtæus  
of the  
Macedonian  
Wars  
Spoken.

Result of  
the  
Macedonian  
Wars  
Spoken—  
Tyrtæus  
and  
Francisco.



the conduct of Aristomachus, assisted by the prophet Theokles, they maintained the strong position for eleven years. At length they were compelled to abandon it. Yet as in the case of Iphiklos the first determining circumstances are represented to have been, not any superiority of bravery or sagacity on the part of the Lacedæmonians, but treacherous betrayal and stratagem, according to the fatal decree of the gods. Unable to maintain Eion longer, Aristomachus, with his wife and a body of his countrymen, forced his way through the ambuscade and quitted the country—some of them returning to Argolis and Eion, and finally migrating to Rhodion. He himself passed the remainder of his days in Rhodes, where he dwelt along with his son-in-law Diapodotes, the ancestor of the noble Rhodians finally called the Diapodidae, celebrated for its numerous Olympic victories.

Such are the main features of what Pausanias calls<sup>1</sup> the second Messenian war, or of what might rather to be called the Aristomachean of the poet Helianus. That after the foundation of Messene, and the result of the union by Epaminondas, favour and evidence were found for many tales respecting the progress of the ancient hero when they invaded<sup>2</sup> in their Messenian—tales well calculated to interest the fancy, to vivify the patriotism, and to inflame the anti-Spartan antipathies, of the new inhabitants—there can be little doubt. And the Messenian legends of that day may well have sung in their public poetical assemblages<sup>3</sup> how "Aristomachus pursued the flying Lacedæmonians down to the mid-plain of Karyphion and up to the very summit of the mountain". From such stories (truths they ought not to be denominated) Rhomus may doubtless have borrowed; but if proof were wanting to show how completely he relied on his materials

Heracles of  
Pharos, the  
hero of the  
war.  
The  
Messenian  
war.  
The  
Messenian  
war.  
The  
Messenian  
war.

<sup>1</sup> The narrative in Pausanias, li. 18.

<sup>2</sup> According to an historical notice in Pausanias, the Messenians offered their king, Aristomachus, the war against Messene, and when he refused, they did not leave the city, but remained in it.

<sup>3</sup> Thus in Messenian life, which, but only recently, has been discovered, the Messenians were, in the eyes of the Spartans, and probably in the eyes of the Greeks, a people of the future.

<sup>4</sup> Compare also Pausan. li. 18, § 1, in. 18, § 1, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Pausanias heard the story himself at Rhodes, where he was in the year 340 B.C.

<sup>6</sup> He is called either Aristomachus or Aristomachus.

<sup>7</sup> According to one story, the Messenians were said to have got possession of the person of Aristomachus, and that he was carried to Rhodes, where he died. Paus. li. 18, § 1, 2.



from the point of view of the poet and not from that of the historian, we should find it to be reasonable (not noticed by Pausanias). Rheon represented Leontyochides as having been king of Sparta during the second Messenian war: now Leontyochides (as Pausanias observed) did not reign until near a century and a half afterwards, during the Persian invasion.<sup>1</sup>

To the great champion of Messenia, during this war, we may oppose on the side of Sparta another reasonable person, less striking as a character of romance, but more interesting in many ways to the historian—I mean the poet Tyrtæus, a native of Aphidæa in Attica, an inextinguishable ally of the Lacedæmonians during most part of this second struggle. According to a story—which however has the air partly of a heart of the later Attic writers—the Spartans, distressed at the first success of the Messenians, consulted the Delphic oracle, and were directed to ask for a leader from Athens. The Athenians complied by sending Tyrtæus, whom Pausanias and Justin represent as a brave man and a schoolmaster, dispatched with a view of continually exhorting the oracle, and yet rendering no real assistance.<sup>2</sup> This seems to be a colouring put upon the story by later writers, but the intervention of the Athenians in the matter in any way deserves little credit.<sup>3</sup> It seems more probable that the legendary connexion of the Dædalus with Aphidæa, celebrated at or near that time by the poet Alkman, brought about through the Delphic oracle the presence of the Aphidæan poet at Sparta.

<sup>1</sup> Pausan. iv. 26. 1.

Perhaps Leontyochides was king during the last decade of the Pelopon. or Messenian, iv. 274 B.C., which is called the third Messenian war. He seems to have been slain in battle. In consequence of his death during the Messenian expedition—his son, we find (Herodotus, ii. 161) the leading of which the Spartans call the third Messenian war—by son iv. 2. 1, was an adequate proof (see *Proc. Acad.* vol. i. p. 175).

The poem of Rhœon was entitled *Heracles*. Alkman composed *Teares*, *Love*, *Wine*, *Argos*. See the fragments—starting they last—in *Orschow's Collection*, p. 26. 17.

He seems to have mentioned *Heracles*, the subject of *Antimachus* (vii.

21. p. 191) compare Pausan. iv. 26. 1.

I may remark that Pausanias throughout his account of the second Messenian war, preserving *Antimachus* as leading the Lacedæmonians, forgets that he has no authority for so doing, as we see by iv. 26. 1. It is a poor indication of his care that the reader surmise of Tyrtæus.

<sup>2</sup> Pausan. iv. 26. 1, Justin, vi. 2. 4. Compare *Vita*, *Longin*, p. 190, *Strabo* vi. 2. 4, *Agath.* and *Antim.* p. 191. *Herodotus* and *Antimachus* also represented him as a native of Aphidæa in Attica, which facts corroborate some slender grounds (viii. p. 192) *Plutarch* (iv. 10. 1000).

<sup>3</sup> *Herodotus*, *Thucyd.* i. 94, *Pausan.* i. 26. 1, *Strabo*, *Antim.* *Agath.* p. 191.

Respecting the juvenescence of Tyrtæus, we can say nothing. But that he was a schoolmaster (if we are constrained to employ an ascertainable term) is highly probable—for in that day, masters who composed and sang poems were the only persons from whom the youth received any mental training. Moreover his very over the youthful mind is particularly noted in the compliment paid to him in after-days by king Leonidas—"Tyrtæus was an adept in stirring the souls of youth."<sup>1</sup> We see enough to satisfy us that he was by birth a stranger, though he became a Spartan by the subsequent recognition of citizenship conferred upon him—that he was sent through the Delphian oracle—that he was an impetuous and effusive minstrel—and that he had moreover sagacity enough to employ his talents for present purposes and diverse needs, being able not merely to reanimate the languishing courage of the halfed warrior, but also to soothe the discontents of the restive. That his studies, which long maintained undiminished popularity among the Spartans,<sup>2</sup> contributed much to determine the ultimate issue of the war, there is no reason to doubt; nor is his name the only one to attest the susceptibility of the Spartan mind in that day towards music and *stated* poetry. The first establishment of the Karneian <sup>biennially</sup> ~~annual~~ festival, with its musical competition at Sparta, falls <sup>in the</sup> ~~in~~ during the period assigned by Pausanias to the second Messenian war: the Lesbian harper Terpander, who gained the first recorded prize at this solemnity, is affirmed to have been sent for by the Spartans pursuant to a mandate from the Delphian oracle, and to have been the means of appearing a soothsayer. In like manner, the Krætan Thaletas was invited (after a penitence, which his art (as it is pretended) contributed to heal (about 630 B.C.); and Alcman, Teocritus, Polyzantus, and Saludas, all foreigners by birth, found favourable reception, and acquired popularity by their music and poetry. With the exception of Saludas, who is a little later, all these names fall in the same century as Tyrtæus, between 600 B.C.—615 B.C. The fashion which the Spartans were continued for a long time to maintain is ascribed chiefly to the genius of Terpander.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *Leonidas*, c. 1. *Apollon* speaks with regard to 38.  
<sup>2</sup> *See* *Plutarch*, *De Gloria*, pp. 124, 125.  
<sup>3</sup> *Plutarchus* *Vita*, c. 12, *De Gloria*, 124, 125.



the Thargian modes in ancient times, are facts perfectly well-attested, however difficult they may be to explain upon any general theory of music.

That the impression produced by Tyrinus at Sparta, therefore, with his martial music, and prophetic exhortations to bravery in the field, as well as music at home, should have been very considerable, is perfectly consistent with the character both of the age and of the people; especially as he is represented to have appeared pursuant to the injunction of the Delphian oracles. From the scanty fragments remaining to us of his elegiac and anapaests, however, we can satisfy ourselves only of two facts: first, that the war was long, obstinately contested, and dangerous to Sparta as well as to the Messenians; next, that other parties in Peloponnesus took part on both sides, especially on the side of the Messenians. So frequent and harassing were the aggressions of the <sup>inhabitants</sup> Messenians upon the Spartan territory, that a large portion of the border land was left uninhabited: scarcely sown, and the proprietors of the deserted farms, driven to despair, pressed for a redress of the <sup>of the</sup> landed property in the state. It was in appearing these circumstances that the poem of Tyrinus called *Encomia*, "Legal order," was found signally beneficial.<sup>1</sup> It seems certain that a considerable portion of the Arcadians, together with the Pisians and the Triphylians, took part with the Messenians; there are also some statements numbering the Elians among their allies, but this appears not probable. The state of the case rather seems to have been, that the old quarrel between the Elians and the Pisians respecting the right to preside at the Olympic games, which had already burst forth during the preceding century in the reign of the Argive Thestis, still continued. Unwilling dependents of Elis, the Pisians and Triphylians took part with the subject Messenians, while the masters at Elis and Sparta made common cause, as they had before done against Thestis.<sup>2</sup> Pausanias king of Tege, revolting from Elis, acted in concert with <sup>of</sup> his countrymen in co-operation with the Messenians; and he is further noted for having, at the period of the 16th Olympiad (564 B.C.), marched a body of troops to Olympia, and there

<sup>1</sup> *Idol. Poët. v. p.* *Epigram. lxxxv. l.* 188, where the Thargian description stands.

<sup>2</sup> *Plutarch. vi. 21. 5.* *Strabo. viii. p.* 356. *The Pisians and Triphylians.*





related in the days of Kleisthenes, in the generation after the restoration of Minos. But whether it had any existence prior to that event, or what degree of truth there may be in the story about Aristodemus, we are unable to determine.<sup>1</sup> The son of Aristodemus, named Aristodorus, is alleged in another authority to have reigned afterwards at Orchomenos.<sup>2</sup> That which stands strongly marked in the sympathy of Alcibiades and Meneleus against Sparta—a sentiment which was in its full vigour at the time of the restoration of Minos.

The second Messenian war was thus terminated by the complete subjugation of the Messenians. Each of them as <sup>remained</sup> in the country was reduced to a servitude <sup>probably</sup> not less hard than that which Tyrtæus <sup>described</sup> them as having endured between the first war and the second. In after-times, the whole territory which figures on the map as Messenia,—south of the river Nadei, and westward of the summit of Taygetus,—appears as subject to Sparta, and as forming the western portion of Laconia; distributed (in what proportion we know not) between Perioeci towns and *Ekoi* villages. By what steps, or after what degree of further resistance, the Spartans conquered this country we have no information; but we are told that they made over *Aspis* to the expelled Dryopes from the Argives *perseuæ*, and *Medon* to the *Lapyrgæ* from *Megara*.<sup>3</sup> Nor do we hear of any serious revolt from Sparta in this territory until 140 years afterwards,<sup>4</sup> consequent to the Persian invasion,—a revolt which Sparta after various efforts, succeeded in crushing, so that the territory remained in her power until her defeat at Leuctra, which led to the foundation of Messia by Epaminondas. The fertility of the plains—especially of the central portion near the river Pamisos, so much extolled by *descriptores*, modern as well as ancient—rendered it an acquisition highly valuable. At some time or other, it must of course have been formally partitioned among

<sup>1</sup> *Strabo*, *op. cit.* *Politi.* *lib. 8*, who quotes Kleisthenes. *Plin.* *lib. 4*, § 4. *Strabo* has *Aspidon*, as cited by *Polibius*, nor the allusion in *Plutarch* (in *the* *Life* of *Alcibiades*) to *Aspidon*, a town, apparently the name of *Aspidon*, for *Aspis* is there highly noted, and long-continued, hence, easily brought in

aid by the intervention of the gods. *Strabo* *Perioeci* describes the *Aspidon* of *Aspidon* as the temple of the *Aspidon* or *Aspidon* and *Aspidon*.

<sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, *Perioeci* *lib. 8*, *lib. 8*, *lib. 8*.

<sup>3</sup> *Strabo*, *Perioeci* *lib. 8*, *lib. 8*, *lib. 8*.

<sup>4</sup> *Strabo*, *Perioeci* *lib. 8*, *lib. 8*, *lib. 8*.





they maintained dispositions to renew the revolt of the 45th Olympiad, under Demophila, the son of Pausanias, and the Helots marched into their country to put them down, but were persuaded to retire by protestations of submission. At length, shortly afterwards, under Pyrrhos, the brother of Demophila, a serious revolt broke out. The inhabitants of Dysonetium and the other villages in the Pisatid, assisted by those of Makistia, Sikina and the other towns in Triphylia, took up arms to throw off the yoke of Elis; but their strength was inadequate to the undertaking. They were completely conquered; Dysonetium was dismantled, and the inhabitants of it obliged to flee the country, from whence most of them emigrated to the colonies of Epidaurea and Apollonia in Epirus. The inhabitants of Makistia and Sikina were also chased from their abodes, while the territory became more thoroughly subject to Elis than it had been before. These incidents seem to have occurred about the 55th Olympiad, or a.d. 540; and the domination of Elis over her Perioikid territory was then as well assured as that of Sparta.<sup>1</sup> The separate dominations both of Pisa and Triphylia became more and more merged in the territory name of Elis: the town of Lepreum alone, in Triphylia, seems to have maintained a separate name and a sort of half-autonomy down to the time of the Peloponnesian war, not without perpetual struggles against the Helots.<sup>2</sup> But towards the period of the Peloponnesian war, the political interests of Laconia had become considerably changed, and it was to her advantage to maintain the independence of the subordinate states against the superior; accordingly, we find her at that time upholding the autonomy of Lepreum. From what came the devastation of the Triphylia towns by Elis which Herodotus mentions as having happened in his time, we do not know; the fact seems to indicate a continual yearning for their original independence, which was still uncommenced, down to a much later

<sup>1</sup> Pausan. vi. 10, 11. v. 4, 45; vi. 10, 11; Strabo, viii. 2, 355-357.

<sup>2</sup> The temple in honour of Hera at Lepreum, the Acra erected by the Pisatid, and the temple of Isis at Dysonetium, vi. 10, 11.

<sup>3</sup> Thucyd. ii. 10. From Lepreum is

characterised as Heliot, however (Lambert, *Ann.* 1891, *supra* also *ibid.* p. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14).

<sup>4</sup> Even in the state Olympiad as a festival of Dysonetium is mentioned as being at the station, under the domination of "an Heliot, from





Archaic villages were usually designated by the names of rivers, consistent with certain etymological names—the Aisines, the Parrhasi, the Menaï (adjuring Mount Menaia), the Parnakti, the Alkyon, the Skirios,<sup>1</sup> &c. Some considerable towns however there were—aggregations of villages or domes which had been once autonomous. Of these the principal were Tegea and Mantinea, bordering on Laconia and Argolis—Orchomenos, Phanoia, and Skyrphades, towards the north-east, bordering on Achæa and Peloponnesus—Eleuter and Heræa, westward, where the country is divided from Elis and Triphylia by the woody mountains of Pholoe and Erymanthos—and Pityaleia, on the south-western border near to Messenia. The most powerful of all were Tegea and Mantinea<sup>2</sup>—contiguous towns, nearly equal in force, lying between them the cold and high plain of Tegeotis, and separated by one of those enormous torrents which only escape through hushoboles. To regulate the efflux of this water was a difficult task, requiring friendly co-operation of both the towns; and when their frequent jealousies brought on a quarrel, the more aggressive of the two invaded the territory of its neighbour as one matter of anarchy. The power of Tegea, which had grown up out of nine constituent townships originally separate,<sup>3</sup> appears to have been more ancient than that of its rival; as we may judge from its splendid heroic pretensions connected with the name of Ekechmos, and from the poet conformed to its hopes in joint Peloponnesian armaments, which was second in distinction only to that of the Lacedæmonians.<sup>4</sup> If it be correct, as Strabo asserts,<sup>5</sup> that the incorporation of the two

<sup>1</sup> *Pharmacol.* vol. 24, p. 1; *Chemistry*, vol. 1, p. 199.

[illegible]

**Microbiology of Filopodia.** In the anoxic, sulfidic waters of Astoria, among the deepest (1000–1200 m),

The article appeared in *Journal of Management Education*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1995. Copyright © 1995 by Sage Publications. All rights reserved. This article may not be reproduced without written permission from the publisher.

<sup>4</sup> *Thompson v. St. Charles*, 100 Cal. 2d 1081, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 857, 498 P.2d 1128 (1972).

100

1000

Parsons, L. S. *Manzanita* is widespread among the red-rock areas of Nevada (Felt's fl. 84). Both *Manzanita* and *Arctostaphylos* had originally occupied very high land sites, and had been replaced on a lower level by *Arctostaphylos*.





them both a check upon their former chief and a support to the re-established Messenians.

It has been necessary thus to bring the situation of the reader for one moment to create long posterior in the order of time (Megalopolis was founded in 370 B.C.), in order that he may understand, by contrast, the general course of those incidents of the earlier time, where direct accounts are wanting. The

boundary  
north of  
Sparta,  
upon the  
northern  
boundary  
of Arcadia.

northern boundary of the Spartan territory was formed by some of the many small Arcadian townships or districts, several of which were successively conquered by the Spartans and incorporated with their dominions, though at what precise time we are unable to say.

We are told that Charilaos, the reputed nephew and ward of Iphicrates, took Megara, and that he also invaded the territory of Tegea, but with singular ill-success, for he was defeated and taken prisoner;<sup>1</sup> we also hear that the Spartans took Megalopolis by surprise in the 10th Olympiad, but were driven out again by the neighbouring Arcadian Oenothorians.<sup>2</sup> During the second Messenian war the Arcadians are represented as cordially assisting the Messenians; and it may seem perhaps singular, that while neither Mantinea nor Tegea are mentioned in this way, the more distant town of Oenothoræ, with its king Aristokrates, takes the lead. But the facts of the contest seem before us with so partial a coloring, that we cannot venture to draw any positive inference as to the times to which they are referred.

Eleus<sup>3</sup> and Karyæ seem to have belonged to the Spartans in the days of Alkman: moreover the district called Skiritæ, bordering on the territory of Tegea—as well as Helosia, and Melosia, to the westward, and Karyæ to the eastward and south-eastward, of Skiritæ—forming all together the entire

Tegea—  
small  
districts  
of the  
Spartans  
against  
Tegea.

northern frontier of Sparta, and all occupied by Arcadian inhabitants—had been conquered and made part of the Spartan territory<sup>4</sup> before 600 B.C. And Herodotus tells us that at this period the Spartan kings Leda and Agesilaos contemplated nothing less

<sup>1</sup> Pausan. II. 1. 1; III. 7. 1; VII. 22. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Pausan. VII. 25. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Alkman, Fr. 16, Witter; Skiritæ, x. p. 208.

<sup>4</sup> That the Skiritæ were Arcadians is undeniably clear; cf. Strabo, lxxv.

<sup>5</sup> Strabo, lxxv. The province of Helosia was disposed of with Sparta, in the days





for more specific directions, and were told that the son of Agamemnon was buried at Tegea itself, in a place "where two blasts were blowing under powerful constraints,—where there was stroke and counter-stroke, and destruction upon destruction". These mysterious words were elucidated by a lucky accident. During a truce with Tegea, Lichas, one of the chiefs of the 300 Spartan chosen youth who acted as the movable police of the country under the ephors, visited the place, and entered the house of a blacksmith—who mentioned to him, in the course of conversation, that in sinking a well in his outer court he had recently discovered a coffin containing a body seven cubits long; astonished at the sight, he had left it there undisturbed. It struck Lichas that the gigantic relics of adventure could be nothing else but the corpse of Orestes, and he felt assured of this when he collected how accurately the indications of the oracle were verified; for there were the "two blasts blowing by constraints," in the two bellows of the blacksmith: there was "the stroke and counter-stroke" in his hammer and anvil, as well as the "destruction upon destruction" in the numerous weapons which he was forging. Lichas said nothing, but returned to Sparta with his discovery, which he communicated to the authorities, who, by a concerted scheme, harassed him under a pretended criminal accusation. He then again returned to Tegea, under the guise of an exile, prevailed upon the blacksmith to let to him the premises, and when he found himself in possession, dug up and carried off to Sparta the bones of the venerated hero.<sup>1</sup>

From and after this fortunate acquisition, the character of the union was changed; the Spartans found themselves constantly victorious over the Tegeans. But it does not seem that these victories led to any positive result, though they might perhaps serve to enhance the practical conviction of Spartan superiority; for the territory of Tegea remained unimpaired, and its autonomy never restrained. During the Persian invasion Tegea appears as the willing ally of Lacedæmon, and as the second military power in the Peloponnese;<sup>2</sup> and we may fairly presume that it was chiefly the

They  
speaking  
himself  
Tegea be-  
cause it was  
strategic;  
near the  
line Tegea  
was the  
first place  
to be taken.

<sup>1</sup> Herod. i. 85—88.

<sup>2</sup> Herod. ix. 38.

stubborn resistance of the Thebans which prevented the Lacedæmonians from extending their empire over the larger portion of the Grecian domination. These latter always maintained their independence, though acknowledging Sparta as the prevailing power in Peloponnesus, and obeying her orders implicitly as to the disposal of their military force. And the influence which Sparta thus possessed over all Greece was one main stem in her power, never seriously shaken until the battle of Leuctra; which took away her previous name of nursing steeds and glories to her minor followers!

Having thus related the extension of the power of Sparta on her northern or Arcadian frontier, it remains to mention her acquisitions on the eastern and north-eastern side, towards Argos. Originally (as has been before stated) not nearly the province of Kyrenia and the Thyreatis, but also the whole coast down to the promontory of Malea, had either been part of the territory of Argos or belonged to the Argive confederacy. 'Welcome from Elisotides,' that before the time when the embassy from Oromas king of Lydia came to solicit aid in Greece (about 847 B.C.), the whole of this territory had fallen into the power of Sparta; but how long before, or at what precise epoch, we have no information. A considerable victory is said to have been gained by the Argives over the Spartans in the 17th Olympiad or 686 B.C., at Hyria, on the road between Argos and Tegea.<sup>1</sup> At that time it does not seem probable that Kyrenia could have been in the possession of the Spartans—so that we must refer the acquisition to some period in the following century; though Pausanias places it much earlier, during the reign of Theopompus<sup>2</sup>—and Bunsen connects it with the first establishment of the heretofore called Gymnaspia at Sparta in 675 B.C.

About the year 465 B.C., the Argives made an effort to reconquer Troezen from Sparta, which led to a combat long memorable in the annals of Greek history. It was agreed between the two cities that the remainder of the territory should

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth Ralston, p. 8, 9. "Many 'spelling' laws will 'spare' law, and in spelling changes and in changing spelling," etc.

be determined by a combat of 300 select champions on each side; the armies of both retiring, in order to leave the field clear. So unhesitated, and so equal was the valour of these two chosen companies, that the battle terminated by leaving only three of them alive—Alkibiad and Chromis among the Argives, Othryades among the Spartans. The two Argive warriors hastened home to report their victory, but Othryades remained on the field, carried off the arms of the enemy's dead into the Spartan camp, and kept his position until he was joined by his countrymen the next morning. Both Argos and Sparta claimed the victory for their respective champions, and the dispute after all was decided by a general conflict, in which the Spartans were the conquerors, though not without much slaughter on both sides. The brave Othryades, ashamed to return home as the single survivor of the 300, fell upon his own sword on the field of battle.<sup>1</sup>

This defeat decided the possession of Thyrea, which did not again pass, until a very late period of Greek history, under the power of Argos. The preliminary duel of 300, with its uncertain issue, though well-established as to the general fact, was represented by the Argives in a manner totally different from the above story, which seems to have been current among the Lacedæmonians.<sup>2</sup> But the most remarkable circumstance is, that more than a century afterwards—when the two powers were negotiating for a renewal of the then expiring truce—the Argives, still hankering after this their ancient territory,

<sup>1</sup> Herod. i. 84; Sparta, vol. v. 274.

<sup>2</sup> The Argives claimed as their champion a Phlegian, son of Alkibiad, called Othryades (Phlegon, p. 36, 37; H. N. v. 2, 3; Strabo i. 2, 3, 4), and the Spartans to Eurymachos (Herodotus, i. 84). The narrative of Othryades, as given by Polyænus (p. 146) seems to be identical with that of Herodotus, and is different in every respect.

Phlegon's second son, Thrypsidion, is mentioned by the Argives (H. N. ii. 3), they tell him that they had recovered it by collecting it when so by whom we do not know. It seems to have passed back to Argos before the close

of the reign of Ptolemy III. at Sparta (H. N. ii. 3), Ptole. i. 30.

Strabo does not mention Phlegon as Argive, in his notice of Thyrea (H. N. ii. 3, 4), though in the place whence he took his story about the time of Ptolemy, it is treated as Lacedæmonian. Compare Strabo, Sparta, vol. ii. Indage 1, p. 26.

Strabo, placing this duel at a much earlier period (H. N. v. 2, 3, 4, p. 27), asserts the first introduction of 300 champions to Sparta, in the hands of Polyænus, at the siege of Mantinea, the Argives (H. N. v. 2) place it still earlier back to the reign of Theseus.

desired the Lacedæmonians to submit the question to arbitration; which being refused, they next stipulated for the privilege of trying the point in dispute by a duel similar to the former, at any time except during the prevalence of war or of epidemic disease. The historian tells us that the Lacedæmonians assented to this proposition, though they thought it absurd,<sup>1</sup> in consequence of their anxiety to keep their relations with Argos at that time smooth and pacific. But there is no reason to imagine that the real duel, in which Othryades contested, was considered as absurd at the time when it took place or during the age immediately succeeding. It fell in with a sort of chivalrous popularity which is noticed among the aristocrats of the early Greece,<sup>2</sup> and also with various legendary exploits, such as the single combat of Echemon and Hyllus, of Melanctus and Teuthis, of Menelaus and Paris, &c. Moreover the heroism of Othryades and his countrymen was a popular theme for poets not only at the Spartan gymnasiums,<sup>3</sup> but also elsewhere, and appears to have been frequently celebrated. The absurdity attached to this proposition, then, during the Peloponnesian war—in the minds even of the Spartans, the most old-fashioned and unchanging people in Greece—is to be ascribed to a change in the Grecian political mind, at and after the Persian war. The habit of political calculation had made such decided progress among them, that the leading states especially had become familiarized with something like a statesmanlike view of their resources, their dangers, and their obligations. More lamentably deficient this sort of sagacity was during the Persian invasion will appear when we come to describe that momentous crisis of Grecian independence: but the events of those days were well calculated to sharpen it for the future, and the Greeks of the Peloponnesian war had become far more refined political schemers than their forefathers. And thus it happened that the proposition to settle a territorial dispute by a duel of chosen champions, admirable

absurdity  
in Greek  
eyes, as  
to the  
wisdom of  
the thing,  
disproved  
itself.

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. i. 12. Talcott & Leake's notes on this passage show, among other things, how ridiculous was the notion of settling disputes by duels, at any time except during the prevalence of epidemic disease.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, vi. 12. Compare the

challenges which Herodotus alludes to have been permitted in the Peloponnese by Aristodemus, through a herald, just before the battle of Plataeæ (q. v.).

<sup>3</sup> Alcman, iv. p. 87.



Nabon on the western coast, to the northern boundary of Thyreatis on the eastern coast. The area of her territory, including as it did both Laconia and Messenia, was equal to two-fifths of the entire peninsula, all possessed from the single city, and for the exclusive purpose and benefit of the citizens of Sparta. Within all this wide area there was not a single community pretending to independent agency. The townships of the Perioeci, and the villages of the Heleas, were each individually unimportant; nor do we hear of any one of them pretending to treat with a foreign state. All consider themselves as nothing else but subjects of the Spartan sphere and their subordinate officers. They are indeed discontented subjects, being as well as having their masters, and not to be treated if a favorable opportunity for escape would present itself. Yet no individual township or district is strong enough to stand up for itself, while combinations among them are prevented by the habitual watchfulness and unscrupulous persecutions of the sphere, especially by that jealous secret police called the Kryptas, to which allusion has already been made.

Full recognition of the exclusive position of Sparta, even from men at war, by the Spartans, before 468 B.C.

Not only therefore was the Spartan territory larger and its population more numerous than that of any other state in Hellas, but its government was also more completely centralized and more strictly obeyed. Its source of weakness was the dissension of its Perioeci and Heleas, the latter of whom were not (like the slaves of other states) imported barbarians from different countries, and speaking a broken Greek, but genuine Hellenes—of one dialect and language, sympathizing with each other, and as much excited to the protection of their Hellenism as their masters—from whom indeed they stood distinguished by no other line except the perfect training, individual and collective, which was peculiar to the Spartans. During the period on which we are at present dwelling, it does not seem that this discontent came seriously into operation; but we shall observe its manifestations very unequivocally after the Persian and during the Peloponnesian war.

Great centralizing power of Sparta, and unity there.

To such auxiliary causes of Spartan predominance we must add another—the excellent military position of Sparta, and the

unsuitable character of Laconia generally. On three sides that territory is washed by the sea, with a coast remarkably dangerous and destitute of harbours;<sup>1</sup> hence Sparta had nothing to apprehend from that quarter until the Persian invasion and its consequences—one of the most remarkable of which was, the astonishing development of the Athenian naval force. The city of Sparta, far removed from the sea, was admirably defended by an almost impassable northern frontier, composed of those districts which we have observed above to have been conquered from Arcadia—Karyttia, Skiritia, Maleitia, and Tegeatisia. The difficulty as well as danger of marching into Laconia by these mountain passes, noticed by Karyttia, was hourly felt by every enemy of the Lacedæmonians, and has been powerfully stated by a first-rate modern observer, Colonel Leake.<sup>2</sup> No site could be better chosen for holding the key of all the penetrable passes than that of Sparta. This well-protected frontier was a substitute more than sufficient for fortifications to Sparta itself, which always maintained, down to the times of the despot Nabis, its primitive

<sup>1</sup> Xenophon, *Hellen.* iv. 5, 7.—*ἀδύνατον τὴν χώραν εἰσελθεῖν ἐκ πύλων.*

<sup>2</sup> *Researches in Greece*, i. 5, 20. *Partly, up the coast, and partly, down the coast, the sea is a wall to us.*

<sup>3</sup> *On the Mountains of Laconia*, and the mountains that divide it, are mentioned within them, that we pass from the primary range of the Lacedæmonian group. These mountains, too, were strengthened by a rapid military discipline, and put to service by an aggressive spirit, first to triumph over their weaker neighbours of Arcadia, by the establishment of a system of direct republics at Argos, and at length, by advancing to form an independent military republic over every other state in Greece.

<sup>4</sup> It is remarkable that all the principal passes into Laconia, lead to the point last noted in Sparta: a fact which derived its force from the position of that city was shown by the failure of the Persians, and how well it was adapted, especially as long as it continued to be unweakened, to provide a perpetual vigilance and resistance to the foe, which was the secret source of Spartan success.

<sup>5</sup> The natural openings into the plain of Sparta are only two; one by the

upper Skiritia, on the south of the river of the Argives, and another, the other by the long range beyond them, over the Skiritia, which, as I have already stated, is the northern approach of the north-eastern extremity of Sparta. All the natural approaches to Sparta, from the northward, lead to one or the other of these two valleys on the side of Mounts, the greatestly pre-eminence of Mount Taygetus, which just above Leonas on the head of Argos, are the principal mountains, forming a wall round Sparta, all the other passes, admitting only of rapid and unobstructed, and which—whether from the Crateris of Argos, to the south-westward of the mountain, or from the Skiritia plain, from the plain of the Peloponnesus, or from the plain of the Argives—all lead to the valley of the upper Skiritia, and are subject to Sparta's vigilance. This is a fact, as I have already stated, which derived its force from the position of that city was shown by the failure of the Persians, and how well it was adapted, especially as long as it continued to be unweakened, to provide a perpetual vigilance and resistance to the foe, which was the secret source of Spartan success.

aspect of a group of adjacent hill-villages rather than a regular order.

When, along with such territorial advantages, we contemplate the personal training peculiar to the Spartan citizens, as yet undisturbed in their numbers,—combined with the effect of that training upon Greek civilization, in inspiring awe and admiration,—we shall not be surprised to find, that during the half-century which elapsed between the year 600 B.C., and the final conquest of Thessaly from Agam. Sparta had acquired and borne

General personal training of the Spartans—such a force when other states were too weak to training at all.

to exercise a recognized ascendancy over all the Greek states. Her military force was at that time superior to that of any of the rest, to a degree much greater than it afterwards came to be; for other states had not yet attained their maximum, and Athens in particular was far short of the height which she afterwards reached. In respect to discipline as well as numbers, the Spartan military force had even at this early period reached a point which it did not subsequently surpass, while in Athens, Thebes, Argos, Arcadia, and even Elis (as will be hereafter shown), the military training in later days received greater attention, and improved considerably. The Spartans (plebeian *Leiotai*) brought to perfection their gymnastic training and their military discipline, at a time when other Greeks neglected both the one and the other: their early superiority was that of the trained man over the untrained, and ceased in after-days when other states came to subject their citizens to systematic exercises of analogous character or tendency. This fact—the early period at which Sparta attained her maximum of discipline, power and territory—is important to bear in mind when we are explaining the general supremacy which her ascendancy met with in Greece, and which her subsequent aim would certainly not have enabled her to earn. That supremacy first began, and became a habit of the Greek mind, at a time when Sparta had no rival to come near her—when she had completely shut that of Argos—and when the vigor of the Lacedæmonian discipline had been manifested

[illegible]

I defined  $P_{\text{PCA}} = 0.1$ , i.e., 10% of the data were known to be good. The algorithm was able to find the good data points and to reject the bad data points.

**Interpretation:** Follow - at this point only  
 action possible - the system will be  
 down. All the other points will be available  
 again. . . . Interpretation: you may not  
 find the system - because it is not there.



in a long series of conquests, made during the stationary period of other states, and ending only (to use the somewhat exaggerated phrase of Herodotus) when she had subdued the greater part of Peloponnesus.<sup>1</sup>

Our accounts of the memorable military organization of Sparta are scanty, and insufficient to place the details of it clearly before us. The arms of the Spartans, as to all material points, were not different from those of other Greek hoplites. But one great peculiarity is observable from the beginning, as at home in the *Lekaneia* institutions. The long-established military divisions quite distinct from the civil divisions, whereas in the other states of Greece, until a period much later than that which we have now reached, the two were confounded—the hoplites or horsemen of the same tribe or ward being marshalled together on the field of battle. Every Lacedæmonian was bound to military service from the age of twenty to sixty, and the ephors, when they sent forth an expedition, called to arms all the men within some given limit of age. Herodotus tells us that *Lekaneia* established both the *Spartia* or public men and the *Endomotia* and *Tristada*, or the military subdivisions peculiar to Sparta.<sup>2</sup> The *Tristada* are not mentioned elsewhere nor can we distinctly make out what they were; but the *Endomotia* was the special characteristic of the system, and the pivot upon which all its arrangements turned. It was a small company of men, the number of whom was variable, being given differently at 30, 50, or 70 men—drilled and practised together in military evolutions, and bound to each other by a common oath.<sup>3</sup> Each *Endomotia* had a separate captain or *komotarch*, the strongest and chief soldier of the company, who

<sup>1</sup> Herod. 1. 81. See Strabo, vol. i. p. 618, and the *Geographical Dictionary* by Niebuhr.

<sup>2</sup> Herod. 1. 81. compare Herod. 2. 169.

<sup>3</sup> Concerning the obscure and difficult subject of the military arrangements of Sparta, see Orosius, *History*, lib. 2, c. 21; Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*, lib. 15, c. 10; Strabo, *Geography*, lib. 8, c. 1; the *Geographical Dictionary*, s. v. *Sparta*; and the *Geography of Greece*, vol. 1, p. 618.

<sup>4</sup> Herod. 1. 81, 168. These names are

misapprehensions, properly, and give 100 hoplites instead of 30, Herod. 1. 81, 168; Strabo, *Geography*, lib. 8, c. 1; Niebuhr, *Geographical Dictionary*, s. v. *Sparta*.

Before the time of Herodotus it is probable that the *Endomotia* were much larger at the first battle of Marathon, than at a later period, as there is no mention of them in the account of that battle. It was (Herod. 1. 81) at the battle of Marathon, of 10 men (Herod. 1. 81) that the language of Herodotus and Thucydides there are simply that the number of such military was equal.





What remains fixed in the system is, first, the small number, though varying within certain limits, of the elementary company called *Enkomiai*;<sup>1</sup> trained to act together, and composed of men nearly of the same age,<sup>2</sup> in which every man knew his place: secondly, the scale of discipline and the hierarchy of officers, each rising above the other,—the *Enkomarch*, the *Protektoros*, the *Lochos*, and the *Polemarch*, or commander of the *Mora*,—each having the charge of their respective divisions. Officers were nominated from the king, as commander-in-chief, through the *Polemarch* to the *Lochos*,—from the *Lochos* to the *Protektoros*, and then from the latter to the *Enkomarch*, each of whom caused them to be created by his *Enkomia*. As all these men had been previously trained in the duties of their respective stations, the Spartan infantry possessed the arrangements and aptitudes of a standing army. Originally they seem to have had no cavalry at all,<sup>3</sup> and when cavalry was at length introduced into their system, it was of a very inferior character, no provision having been made for it in the *Lochos* system. But the military force of the other states of Greece, even down to the close of the Peloponnesian war, enjoyed little or no special training, having neither any small company like the *enkomia*, consisting of particular men drilled to act together—nor fixed and disciplined officers—nor triple scale of education and subdivision. Gymnastics and the use of arms made a part of education everywhere, and it is to be presumed that no Greek hoplite was entirely without some practice of marching in line and military evolutions, inasmuch as the obligation to serve was universal and often enforced. But such practice was casual and unregular, nor had any individual of Argos or Athens a fixed military place and duty. The militia took arms among his wife, under a *Trocharch* chosen from it for the occasion, and was placed in a rank or line whence neither his place nor his immediate neighbours were predetermined. The tribe appears to have been the only

In other  
Greece,  
where there  
was no  
regular  
military  
discipline,  
selected  
troops from the  
tribe.

<sup>1</sup> *enkomia* thirty-two men. But Xenophon tells us that each *mora* had four *tribes*, each tribe two *enkomiai*, and each *enkomia* two *enkomiai* (Chap. I. c. 2, 3). The nature of these divisions would be more but the numbers varied.

<sup>2</sup> This is implied in the fact that the men under *Lochos*, or under *tribe*, five years of age, were often introduced in a battle to form the right wing of the army (Xen. *Hellen.* v. 2, 11-12).

<sup>3</sup> Joseph. *Judea*, vi. 2, 10.



fragments—while the Pythian, Isthmian, and Nemean games were exalted into a national importance, approaching to that of the Olympia. The despised superiority of Sparta then formed part, and part of the first historical aggregation of the Grecian states.<sup>1</sup> It was about the year 547 B.C., that Croesus of Lydia, when pressed by Cyrus and the Persians, solicited aid from Greece, addressing himself to the Spartans as confederal presidents of the whole Hellenic body.<sup>2</sup> And the tenderness then at work, towards a certain degree of increased reticence and co-operation among the dispersed members of the Hellenic name, was doubtless assisted by the existence of a state recognised by all as the first—a state whose superiority was the more readily acquiesced in, because it was earned by a painful and laborious discipline, which all admired, but none chose to copy.<sup>3</sup>

Whether it be true (as G. Müller and other learned men conceive) that the Homeric mode of fighting was the general practice in Peloponnesus and the rest of Greece anterior to the invasion of the Dorians, and that the latter first introduced the habit of fighting with close ranks and prolonged spears, is a point which cannot be determined. Throughout all our historical knowledge of Greece, a close rank among the hoplites, changing with spears always in hand, is the prevailing practice; though there are cases of exception, in which the spear is hurled, when troops were afraid of coming to close quarters.<sup>4</sup> Nor is it by any means certain, that the Homeric manner of fighting ever really prevailed in Peloponnesus, which is a country eminently inconvenient for the use of war-chariots. The description of the battle may perhaps

Strongly  
marks of  
fighting—  
phalanx—  
spears  
in rank,  
as in  
Greece.

<sup>1</sup> *Thales* etc. mentioned, according to the tradition (Thucyd. i. 10), compare I. ii. 4, 20, vi. 34, with Sparta's history.

<sup>2</sup> *Herodotus*, *Book* I. c. 4, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

The description of the Peloponnesian war given by the ancient writers, includes a remarkable instance of the most despised practice and bravery of the Spartans, who the system, practice and maintenance of which the Spartans were called upon to adopt (not only) at the same time

it affects the general effect which that fighting practice upon the mind of Greece (Thucyd. i. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

The impression of the light bronze given, they first began to think the hoplites were to be the best of Peloponnesus is strongly expressed by Thucydides (ii. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 35



quest of Thyrridæ by the Spartans deprived the Argives of a valuable portion of their Peræas, or dependent territory. But Oræon and the bounding portion of Rymæris<sup>1</sup> still continued to belong to them: the plain round their city was very productive; and, except Sparta, there was no other power in Peloponnesus superior to them. Mykænæ and Thyra, nevertheless, seem both to have been independent states at the time of the Persian war, since both sent contingents to the battle of Plataeæ, at a time when Argos held almost entire sway over the Peræas.

At what time Eleusis became the ally or dependent of Argos, we cannot distinctly make out. During the Peloponnesian war it is numbered in that character along with Oræon;<sup>2</sup> but it seems not to have lost its autonomy about the year 470 B.C., at which period Pausanias represents the Eleusians as providing and distributing prizes at the Nemean games.<sup>3</sup> The game of Nemea was less than two miles from their town, and they were the original promoters of this great festival—a function of which they were subsequently robbed by the Argives, in the same manner as the Paestans had been treated by the Sicilians with reference to the Olympic Agôn. The extinction of the autonomy of Eleusis, and the acquisition of the presidency of the Nemean festival by Argos, were decisive circumstances, but we are unable to mark the exact time. For the statement of Diodorus, that the Argives celebrated the Nemean festival as early as the third Olympiad, or 604 B.C., is contradicted by the more valuable evidence of Pausanias.<sup>4</sup>

For our  
quest of  
Mykænæ,  
Thyra, and  
Oræon—  
Peræas  
proper.

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, vii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, vii. 17. Mykænæ distinguished two places called Oræon, one a village in the Argian territory, the other a town between Corinth and Sikyon (see I. 1047). Whether there were other two places so called, the form of village suggested, we think, gives the only place (Oræon, vii. 17. 18).

<sup>3</sup> Pausanias, vi. 10. 11. The Eleusians are thought to have aided the Argives in the destruction of Sikyon, especially with the Taphians (see below). However, we cannot help suspecting as to their independence at that time (Herodotus, vii. 17).

<sup>4</sup> Herodotus, vii. 17. 18. Diodorus, xiv. 93. 94. Pausanias, vi. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

<sup>5</sup> The Sacred Eleusinian Agôn, vii. 1.

The last Nemean Agôn of Pausanias is the only one of the four Nemean Agônes, mentioned as it is considered lost, and supposed to be given by Thebes, a subject of Argos. But there have been many disputes about supplanting between Argos and Thebes as to the subject of the first Agôn of this festival. Pausanias would seem to side in favour of the Corinthians, against the Eleusians as promoters.

The statement of the Sicilians as to Pausanias, that the Corinthians at one time celebrated the Nemean games, is that they were at one time, as the Sicilians, were understood to have. Paus. Ag. vii. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.



Of Corinth and Sikya. It will be more convenient to speak when we survey what is called the Age of the Tyrants or Despots; and of the inhabitants of Achæia (who occupied the southern coast of the Corinthian Gulf, westward of Sikya as far as Cape Arizæa, the north-western point of Peloponnesus), a few words sufficient, on whole knowledge, down to the time at which we are arrived. These Achæians are given to us as representing the ante-Dorian inhabitants of Laconia, whom the legend affirms to have retired under Tazmenus to the northern parts of Peloponnesus, from whence they expelled the pre-existing Ionians and occupied the country. The race of their kings is said to have lasted from Tazmenus down to Ogyges<sup>1</sup>—how long we do not know. After the death of the latter, the Achæian towns formed such a separate republic, but with periodical intercourse and alliance at the Temple of Zeus Koumanta, affording opportunity of settling differences and arranging their common concerns. Of these towns, twelve are known from Herodotus and Strabo—Pellæ, Agira, Siga, Bora, Halis, Agira, Elappa, Patra, Thara, Olousa, Dynd, Tinea.<sup>2</sup> But there must originally have been some other autonomous towns besides these twelve; for in the third Olympiad, Ilarxus of Hypæria was proclaimed as victor, and there seems good reason to believe that Hypæria, an old town of the Homeric Catalogue, was in Achæia.<sup>3</sup> It is affirmed that, before the Achæian occupation of the country, the Ionians had dwelt in independent villages, several of which were subsequently aggregated into towns; thus Patra was formed by a collection of seven villages, Dynd from eight (one of which was named Teuthæ), and Agira also from seven or eight. But all these towns were small, and some of them underwent a further junction one with the other; thus Siga was joined with Agira, and Olousa with Dynd.<sup>4</sup> All the authors seem disposed to recognize twelve cities, and no more, in Achæia; for Polybius, still adhering to that number, substitutes Leonidia and Euryana

<sup>1</sup> Polyb. ii. 40.

<sup>2</sup> Herodot. i. 64; Strabo, vii. p. 386.

<sup>3</sup> Pausan. ii. 12, 1; Strabo, vii. p. 387. Elappa, Strabo, ii. 109. Pausanias mentions many Ionian Greek colonies when he tells us that the name of Hypæria was exchanged for that of

Agira, during the time of the Ionian occupation of the country (vii. 10, 1). Strabo, vii. 386, repeats this. \* Strabo, vii. 386, doubts whether the two latter belonged to the same place, but does not mention the name Teuthæ.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo, vii. pp. 387, 388, 389.

in place of *Hyge* and *Hygeon*; *Panama* gives *Karynia* in place of *Petee*.<sup>1</sup> We hear of no facts respecting these Achaean towns until a short time before the Peloponnesian war, and even then their part was inconsiderable.

The greater portion of the territory comprised under the name of Achaia was mountain, forming the northern descent of those high ranges, passable only through very difficult passes, which separate the country from Arcadia to the north, and which throw out various spurs approaching closely to the Gulf of Corinth. A strip of flat land, with white clayey soil, often very fertile, between these mountains and the sea, formed the plain of each of the Achaean towns, which were situated for the most part upon steep rocky embankments overlooking it. From the mountains between Achaia and Arcadia, numerous streams flow into the Corinthian Gulf, but few of them are perennial, and the whole length of coast is represented as barbaenian.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Polyn.* B. 41.

<sup>2</sup> See *Luthe's Travels in Greece*, v. 266ff. and 268ff.

## CHAPTER IX.

## CORINTH, MITYLÆ, AND MEGARA—AGE OF THE GREEK EMPIRE.

I HAVE thus brought down the history of Sparta to the period marked by the reign of Pericles at Athens; at which time she had attained her maximum of territory, was confessedly the most powerful state in Greece, and enjoyed a proportionate degree of defence from the east. I now proceed to touch upon the three Doric cities on and near to the Isthmus—Corinth, Sikyon, and Megara, as they existed at this same period.

Even amidst the scanty information which has reached us, we trace the marks of considerable maritime energy and commerce among the Corinthians, as far back as the eighth century B.C. The foundation of Korcyra and Syracuse, in the eleventh Olympiad, or 734 B.C. (of which I shall speak further in connexion with Greek colonisation generally), by expeditions from Corinth, affords proof that they knew how to turn to account the excellent situation which connected them with the sea on both sides of Peloponnese. Moreover Thucydides,<sup>1</sup> while he notices them as the chief theatre of the sea in early times from pirates, also tells us that the first great improvement in ship-building—the construction of the trireme, or ship of war, with a full deck and single banks for the rowers—was the fruit of Corinthian ingenuity. It was in the year 508 B.C. that the Corinthian Aristoclides built four triremes for the Samians, the first which those islands had ever possessed. The notice of this last attests as well the importance attached to the new invention, as the humble scale on which the naval force in those early days was equipped. And it is a fact of

<sup>1</sup>Thucyd. i. 10.





the three above-mentioned towns,—Corinth, Sikyon, and Megara—underwent during the course of the same century a similar change of government. In each of them a despot established himself: Orthagoras in Sikyon; Kypselos in Corinth; Thargos in Megara.

Unfortunately we have too little evidence as to the state of things by which this change of government was produced and brought about, to be able to appreciate fully its bearing. But what draws our attention to it more particularly is, that the like phenomenon seems to have occurred contemporaneously throughout a large number of cities, continental, insular and colonial, in many different parts of the Grecian world. The period between 800 and 600 B.C. witnessed the rise and downfall of many despots and despotic dynasties, each in its own separate city. During the succeeding interval between 600 and 500 B.C., new despots, though occasionally springing up, become ever rarer. Political despots take another turn, and the question is raised directly and intensely between the many and the few—the people and the oligarchy. But in the still later times which follow the battle of Marathon, in proportion as Greece, declining in civil not less than in military spirit, is driven to the constant employment of mercenary troops, and harassed by the overbearing interference of foreigners—the despot with his standing foreign body-guard becomes again a characteristic of the time; a tendency partially constructed, but never wholly subdued, by Aratus and the Achæan league of the third century B.C.

It would have been instructive if we had possessed a faithful record of these changes of government in some of the more considerable of the Grecian towns. In the absence of such evidence, we can do little more than collect the brief sentences of Aristotle and others respecting the causes which produced them. For as the like change of government was common, near about the same time, in cities very different in locality, in race of inhabitants, in tastes and habits, and in wealth, it must partly have depended upon certain general causes which admit of being assigned and explained.

In a preceding chapter I tried to elucidate the heroic pastorate of Megara, so far as it could be known from the epic poems—a government founded (if we may employ modern phraseology)

upon divine right as opposed to the sovereignty of the people, but requiring, as an essential condition, that the king shall possess force, both of body and mind, not unworthy of the exalted trust to which he belongs.<sup>1</sup> In this government the authority, which pervades the whole society, all resides in the king. But on important occasions it is exercised through the forms of publicity: he consults, and even discusses, with the council of chiefs or elders—he communicates after such consultation with the assembled Agens,—who hear and approve, perhaps hear and reprove, but are not understood to exercise an option or to reject. In giving an account of the Lycurgean system, I remarked that the old primitive Rhetor (or choros of company) indicated the existence of these same elements; a king of superhuman force (in this particular case two co-ordinate kings)—a senate of twenty-eight old men, besides the kings who sat in it—and an Ekklisia or public assembly of citizens, convened for the purpose of approving or rejecting propositions submitted to them, with little or no liberty of discussion. The elements of the heroic government of Greece are thus found to be substantially the same as those existing in the primitive Lycurgean constitution; in both cases the predominant force residing in the kings, and the functions of the senate, still more those of the public assembly, being comparatively narrow and restricted; in both cases the royal authority being upheld by a certain religious sanction, which tended to exclude rivalry and to ensure submission in the people up to a certain point, in spite of misconduct or delinquency in the reigning individual. Among the principal Hellenic tribes this government subsisted down to the third century A.D.,<sup>2</sup> though some of them had passed out of it, and were in the habit of electing annually a president out of the gens to which the king belonged.

Starting from these points, common to the Grecian heroic government, and to the original Lycurgean system, we find that in the Grecian cities generally the king is replaced by an oligarchy, consisting of a limited number of families—while at Sparta the kingly authority, though greatly curtailed, is never abolished. And the different turn of events at

<sup>1</sup> See a pretty passage in Plutarch, *Pericles*, c. 2, p. 381.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, *Pericles*, c. 2, p. 381.

Sparta admits of being partially explained. It so happened that for five centuries neither of the two coordinate lines of Sparta kept was ever without some male representatives, so that the sentiment of divine right, upon which their pre-eminence was founded, always presented an unbroken channel. That sentiment never wholly died out in the tender mind of Sparta, but it became sufficiently satisfied to content a demand for guarantee against abuse. If the senate had been a more transverse body, composed of a few principal families, and comprising men of all ages, it might perhaps have extended its powers as much as to check those of the king. But a council of twenty-eight old men, chosen indiscriminately from all Spartan families, was essentially unadapted and secondary force. It was insufficient even as a restraint upon the king—still less was it competent to become his rival; and it served indirectly even as a support to him, by preventing the formation of any other privileged order powerful enough to be an overmatch for his authority. This insufficiency on the part of the senate was one of the causes which occasioned the formation of the assembly named Council of Five, called the Ephors; originally a defensive board like the Roman Tribunes, intended as a restraint upon abuse of power on the king's part, but afterwards expanding into a permanent and irresponsible Executive Directory. Assisted by endless discussions between the two coordinate kings, the Ephors encroached upon their power on every side, limited them to certain special functions, and even rendered them accountable and liable to punishment, but never sought to abolish the dignity. That which the royal authority lost in extent (to borrow the just remark of king Theopompus<sup>1</sup>) it gained in durability. The descendants of the twins Hærothephæ and Prokles continued in possession of their double sceptre from the earliest historical times down to the revolutions of Agis III. and Kleomenes III.—generals of the military force, growing richer and richer, and honoured as well as influential in the state, though the Directory of Ephors were their superiors. And the Ephors became in time quite as despotic, in reference to internal affairs, as the kings could ever have been before them. For the Spartan

<sup>1</sup> *Antiqu. Troit. v. 3, l.*



ward, deeply possessed with the feelings of command and obedience, remained comparatively insensitive to the ideas of equal and responsibility, and even averse to that open discussion and course of public measures or officers which such ideas imply. We must recollect that the Spartan political constitution was both simplified in its character and aided in its working by the comprehensive range of the Lycurgus discipline with its rigorous equal pressure upon rich and poor, which created many of the causes elsewhere productive of sedition,—habituating the president and most refractory citizen to a life of unrelenting endurance—satisfying such demand as existed for system and regularity—rendering Spartan personal habits of life much more equal than even democratical Athens could parallel; but contributing at the same time to engender a contempt for talkers, and a dislike of methodical and prolonged speech, which of itself sufficed to exclude all regular interference of the collective citizen, either in political or judicial affairs.

Such were the facts of Sparta. But in the rest of Greece the primitive heroic government was modified in a very different manner: the people outgrew, much more decidedly, that feeling of divine right and personal reverence which originally gave authority to the king. Willing submission ceased on the part of the people, and still more on the part of the inferior chiefs; and with it ceased the heroic royalty. Something like a system or constitution came to be demanded.

Of this circumstance of kingship, as universal in the political march of Hellas, one main cause is doubtless to be sought in the smallness and concentrated richness of each distinct Hellenic society. A single chief, perpetual and unresponsible, was nearly essential for the maintenance of union. In modern Europe, for the most part, the different political societies which grew up out of the Roman empire embraced each a considerable population and a wide extent of territory. The monarchial form presented itself as the only known means of union between the parts; the only visible and imposing symbol of a national identity. Both the military character of the Teutonic invasions, as well as the traditions of the Roman empire which they dismembered, tended towards the

1  
 character-  
 istic of  
 kingship  
 in heroic  
 societies.

Example

2

Compari-  
 son with  
 the middle  
 ages of  
 Europe.

establishment of a monarchial chief. The abolition of his dignity would have been looked upon as equivalent, and would really have been equivalent, to the breaking up the nation; since the maintenance of a collective nation by means of general assemblies was as burdensome, that the kings themselves nearly tried to evade it by force, and representative government was then unknown.

The history of the middle ages—through exhibiting constant resistance on the part of powerful subjects, frequent deposition of individual kings, and occasional changes of dynasty—contains few instances of any attempt to maintain a large political aggregate united without a king, either hereditary or elective. Even towards the close of the last century, at the period when the federal constitution of the United States of America was first formed, many statesmen regarded<sup>1</sup> as an impossibility the application of any other system than the monarchical to a territory of large size and population, so as to combine unity of the whole with equal privileges and securities to each of the parts. And it might perhaps be a real impossibility among any rude people, with strong local peculiarities, difficult means of communication, and habits of representative government not yet acquired. Hence throughout all the larger empires of medieval and modern Europe, with few exceptions, the prevailing sentiment has been favourable to monarchy; but wherever any single city or district, or cluster of villages, whether in the plains of Lombardy or in the mountains of Switzerland, has acquired independence—wherever any small fraction has severed itself from the aggregate—the opposite sentiment has been found, and the natural tendency has been towards some modification of republican government;<sup>2</sup> out of which indeed, as in Greece, a despot has often

<sup>2</sup> See this subject discussed in the extensive collection of letters, called the "Petersburg" written in 1797, during the time when the Federal constitution of the United States of America, was under discussion—*Letters*, 3, 13, 14, by J. C. Mohr.

<sup>100</sup> Il est de la tradition d'après laquelle le jeune Rembrandt, après son mariage, fut un des premiers artistes à peindre sa femme nue, sans voile, sans ses parents présents.

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 145, ed. 1970, after mentioning "that all kinds of governments, from autocracy to democracy, seem to have succeeded in making their way in the organized world," he adds: "The only chance for the future, with respect both to living and domestic organization, is democracy." (p. 146.)

"But, though all kinds of games must be improved in order that they may be played, government must in turn make the ground a traver towards perfection. It may now be said of almost everyone who

was engendered, but always through some material masters of force and fraud. The feudal system, evolved out of the disordered state of Europe between the eighth and thirteenth centuries, always presented a permanent element, vested with large rights of a real personal and proprietary character over his vassals, though subject also to certain obligations towards them: the immediate vassals of the king had subordinate vassals of their own, to whom they stood in the same relation; and in the hierarchy of power, property, and territory blended together, the rights of the chief, whether king, duke, or baron, were conceived as constituting a status apart, and neither conferred originally by the grant, nor revocable at the pleasure of those over whom they were exercised. This view of the essential nature of political authority was a point in which the three great elements of modern European society—the Teutonic, the Roman, and the Christian—all concurred, though each in a different way and with different modifications; and the result was a variety of attempts on the part of subjects to compromise with their chief, without any idea of substituting a delegated executive in his place. On particular points of these feudal monarchies there grew up gradually towns with a concentrated population, among whom was seen the remarkable combination of a republican feeling, demanding collective and responsible management in their own local affairs, with a necessity of union and subordination towards the great monarchical whole; and hence again arose a new force tending both to maintain the form, and to determine the march of kindly government.<sup>1</sup> And it has been shown

was largely sold in pairs, or quadruples, since they are a percentage of lawn, not of stem. They are low, transverse of stem, pointed, and are found in a separate division. Properly in their order, they are numbered, like the turfs, and the price list mentioning the quantity, and a dollar among the children. There are perhaps, and have been for some time, two little islands, primary, green, and small, in Europe, and the very young pairs in each region are very common. And there have been in the whole two thousand specimens or specimens, on the English coast, the small ones, and of these there have not been any, and none, Friday 11, of 1846, as well as the others, which

Here, Swanton, who was born in 1876, says that the Roman empire, "it must be said, he believed, had through materialism and materialism had spiritualized belief in people, even to gluttony and sloth." He says that much earlier, "The modern materialism and modern faith, from materialism and materialism, they are not, but he said, as he has said, he has said, he said, the materialism of that time of materialism."

© 1994 by Cambridge University Press  
 Printed in the United Kingdom  
 This book is based on the lectures given at the  
 Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, in  
 1992. It is a revised and expanded version of the  
 book published in 1988.

*Journal of Management Education*, Vol. 26 No. 1, February 2002  
© 2002 Sage Publications  
10.1177/1053426902238001  
<http://jme.sagepub.com>

— *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1997



cannot parallel to those societies, whilst in the Hellenic societies such cases had no place—in order that we may approach Hellenic phenomena in the proper spirit, and with an impartial estimate of the feeling universal among Greeks towards the idea of a king. The primitive sentiment entertained towards the heroic king died out, passing first into indifference, next—after experience of the despot—into determined antipathy.

To an historian like Mr. Mitford, full of English ideas respecting government, the anti-monarchical feeling appears of the nature of madness, and the Greek constitution like madness without a keeper: while the greatest of all benefactors is the hereditary king who conquers them from without—the second best is the home despot who enters the acropolis and puts his fellow-citizens under coercion. There cannot be a more certain way of misinterpreting and distorting Greek phenomena than to read them in this spirit, which reverses the maxims both of prudence and morality current in the ancient world. The hatred of kings as it stood among the Greeks (whatever may be thought about a similar feeling now) was a pre-eminently virtue, flowing directly from the noblest and wisest part of their nature. It was a consequence of their deep conviction of the necessity of universal legal restraint; it was a direct expression of that regulated sociability which required the control of individual passion from every one without exception, and most of all from him to whom power was confided. The conception which the Greeks formed of an irresponsible One, or of a king who could do no wrong, may be expressed in the pregnant words of Herodotus: "He subverts the customs of the country: he violates women: he puts men to death without trial". No other conception of the probable tendencies of kingship was justified either by a general knowledge of human nature, or by political experience as it stood from Solon downward: no other feeling than abhorrence could be entertained for the character so conceived: no other than a man of unprincipled ambition would ever seek to limit himself with it.

Our larger political experience has taught us to modify this

<sup>1</sup> Herod. ii. 121. Regards to moral virtues, not political qualities, centres in England.

opinion, by showing that under the conditions of monarchy in the best governments of modern Europe the accidents described by Aristotle did not take place—and that it is possible, by means of representative constitutions acting under a certain force of manners, customs, and historical recollection, to obviate many of the weaknesses likely to flow from proclaiming the duty of presumptuous obedience to an hereditary and unresponsible king, who cannot be changed without extra-constitutional force. For such larger observation was not open to Aristotle, the extent as well as the most serious of ancient theories: nor if it had been open, could he have applied with assurance its lessons to the governments of the single cities of Greece. The theory of a constitutional king, especially, as it exists in England, would have appeared to him impossible: to establish a king who will reign without governing—in whose name all government is carried on, yet whose personal will is in practice of little or no effect—except from all responsibility, without making use of the exception—reserving from every one uncontrolled demonstrations of homage, which are never translated into act except within the bounds of a known law—surrounded with all the paraphernalia of power, yet acting as a passive instrument in the hands of ministers marked out for his choice by indications which he is not at liberty to resist. This remarkable combination of the fiction of unqualified grandeur and honour with the reality of an unreluctant subordination, is what an Englishman has in his mind when he speaks of a constitutional king. The events of our history have brought it to pass in England, whilst no statesman the most powerful that the world has yet seen—but we have still to learn whether it can be made to exist elsewhere, or whether the occurrence of a single king, at once able, aggressive, and resistive, may not suffice to break it up. To Aristotle, certainly, it could not have appeared otherwise than unintelligible and impossible: not likely even in a single case—but altogether unworkable as a permanent system, and with all the diversion of temper inherent in the successive members of an hereditary dynasty. When the Greeks thought of a man exempt from legal responsibility, they conceived him as really and truly such, in deed as well as in name, with a debauched conscience exposed to his oppressions; and their fear and hatred of him was answered by their reverence for a govern-



mechanical administration, which made up for the personal deficiencies of the hereditary king, became too bulky to exercise working principle, the petty prince was in too close contact with his people, and too heavily furnished out in every way, to get up a prestige or delusion of any other kind. He had no means of overruling their imaginations by that combination of pomp, seducement, and mystery, which Herodotus and Xenophon so well appreciate among the attributes of kingship.<sup>1</sup> As there was no more feeling upon which a perpetual child could rest his power, so there was nothing in the circumstances of the community which rendered the maintenance of such a dignity necessary for visible and effective union.<sup>2</sup> In a single city, and a small circumscript community, collective deliberation and general rules, with temporary and responsible magistrates, were practicable without difficulty.

To maintain an irresponsible king, and thus to contrive arrangements which shall extract from him the benefits of responsible government, is in reality a highly complicated system, though, as has been remarked, we have become familiar with it in modern Europe. The more simple and obvious change is, to substitute one or more temporary and responsible magistrates in place of the king himself. Such was the course which Athens took in Greece. The inferior chiefs, who had originally served as council to the king, found it possible to supersede him, and to alternate the functions of administration among themselves; retaining probably the occasional convocation of the general assembly, as it had existed before, and with as little practical efficacy. Such was in substance the character of that mutation which occurred generally throughout the Grecian states, with the exception of Sparta: kingship was abolished, and an oligarchy took its place—a council <sup>Greece is oligarchical</sup> deliberating collectively, deciding general matters by <sup>government</sup> the majority of votes, and selecting some individuals of their

<sup>1</sup> See Herodotus of Halicarnassus the Great, *History*, I. 96, evidently an allusion drawn by Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, also the *Symposium* of Xenophon, III. 5. 20, etc. II. 3. 2-14; etc. I. 2. . . . all which show clearly that the system was superior to the despotic despism of monarchies, and that it was practicable upon a small

scale, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *History of Greece*, Henry Hall, On the Rise and Progress of the Law and Liberty, p. 101, et. seq. The whole of the chapter on the origin of the monarchy, upon the nature of the government, and the establishment of the monarchy, is very interesting, and is highly recommended, etc. etc.





seventh century B.C. Though they had little immediate tendency to liberate the mass of the freemen, yet when we compare them with the antecedent hereditary government, they indicate an important advance—the first adoption of a deliberate and preserved system in the management of public affairs.<sup>1</sup> They exhibit the first evidence of new and important political ideas in the Greek world—the separation of legislative and executive powers; the former vested in a collective body, not merely deliberating but also finally deciding—while the latter is confined to temporary individual magistracies, responsible to that body at the end of their period of office. We are first introduced to a community of citizens, according to the definition of Aristotle—men qualified, and thinking themselves qualified, to take turns in command and obedience. The collective sovereign, called The City, is thus constituted. It is true that this first community of citizens comprised only a small proportion of the men possessed free; but the ideas upon which it was founded began gradually to dawn upon the minds of all. Political power had lost its heaven-appointed character, and had become an attribute legally communicable as well as determinable to certain definite ends: and the ground was thus laid for those thousand questions which agitated so many of the Grecian cities during the ensuing three centuries, partly respecting its apportionment, partly respecting its employment,—questions sometimes raised among the members of the privileged oligarchy itself, sometimes between that order as a whole and the non-privileged Many. The seeds of those popular movements, which called forth so much profound emotion, so much bitter animosity, so much energy and talent, throughout the Grecian world, with different modifications in each particular city, may thus be traced back to that early revolution which erected the primitive oligarchy upon the ruins of the hereditary kingdom.

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, *Pol.* ii. 12, 7, says that the cities of early times had had their different forms of government before the establishment of the laws of Draco and Solon, which he states to have been the first of the different kinds of laws, and the first of the different forms of government.

But he is, of course, the great

author for which the European knows in the middle ages, in the middle of the middle ages, in the middle of the middle ages, and ultimately decided, a character of immortality, and a quality that perhaps of eternal significance.



live a group of retainers and seize the acropolis. And there were examples, though rare, of a fourth variety—the head descendant of the ancient kings—who, instead of suffering himself to be restricted or placed under control by the oligarchy, found means to subjugate them, and to extract by force an *anarchy* as great as that which his forefathers had enjoyed by consent. To these must be added, in several Greek states, the *Reynolds* or Dictator, a citizen formally invested with exporeal and unexpirable power, placed in command of the military force, and armed with a standing body-guard, but only for a time named, and in order to deal with some urgent peril or ruinous internal dissension.<sup>1</sup> The person thus styled, always enjoying a large measure of confidence, and generally a man of ability, was sometimes so successful, or made himself so essential to the community, that the term of his office was prolonged, and he became practically despot for life; or even if the community were not disposed to concede to him the permanent anarchy, he was often strong enough to keep it against their will.

Such were the different modes in which the numerous Greek despots of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. exercised acquired power. Though we know this much, however, in general terms from the brief statements of Aristotle, yet unhappily we have no contemporary picture of any one of these despots, so as to give us the means of appreciating the change in detail. Of the persons who, possessing inherited kingly dignity, exercised their paternal power so far as to become despots, Aristotle gives us Phidias of Argos as an example, whose reign has been already sketched. Of those who made themselves despots by means of official power previously held under an oligarchy, he names Phylarchus at Agriguntum and the despots at Miletus and other cities of the Ionic Greeks; naming others who rose themselves by becoming demagogues, he speaks Pericles in the Athenian town of Locusts, Xerxes at Clusium, and Polistratus at Athens.<sup>1</sup> Of Spartan or

[illegible]

Bl. 2, 75-76, *Monist.*, 1931, p. 377; and  
English, *Progenies*, *Arctic Palaeogeography*,  
and *Flora*, p. 131, *Geograph. Tidsskrift*,  
Copenhagen, 1931, 33, 2, p. 4, 2. 4, 2.  
Arcticity refers to that of this group.

shown despots, Pittacus of Mitylene is the prominent instance. The military and aggressive despots, subsiding as oligarchy which had degraded and almost lost, governing as a cruel despot for several years, and at last deposed and slain, is further depicted by Diogenes of Euboea in the history of Aristodemus of the Italian Ocean.<sup>1</sup>

From the general statement of Thucydides as well as of Aristotle, we learn that the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. were centuries of progress for the Greek cities generally, in wealth, in power, and in population; and the numerous colonies founded during this period (of which I shall speak in a future chapter) will furnish further illustration of such progressive tendencies. Now the changes just mentioned in the Greek governments, insofar as we know them, are on the whole decided evidence of advancing citizenship. For the hereditary government, with which Greek communities begin, is the rudest and most defective of all governments: defective even of the presence of system or security, incapable of being in any way permanent, and depending only upon the accidental variations in the character of the reigning individual, who in most cases, far from acting as a protection to the poor against the rich and great, was likely to indulge his passions in the same uncontrolled way as the latter, and with still greater impunity.

The despots, who in so many towns succeeded and supplanted this oligarchical government, though they advanced on principles usually narrower and selfish, and often oppressively cruel, "taking as thought (to use the expressive words of Thucydides) except such for his own body and his own family"—yet since they were not strong enough to crush the Greek mind, imprinted upon it a painful but improving political lesson, and contributed much to enlarge the range of experience as well as to determine the subsequent course of feeling.<sup>2</sup> They partly broke down the wall of distinction

of Athens as his evidence respecting the character of Pittacus, a very unobscure, poor, and obscure man, who may well be said to have been the first instance of the kind, since those only there.

<sup>1</sup> Diogen. Laert., d. B. vii. 2, 11. The

story of Aristodemus is told about 300 B.C. Thucyd. i. 10. Thucydides is very free to call Aristodemus a tyrant, and to say that the people persecuted him, and to say that the first step taken by the tyrant was to destroy the people, and to say that the first step taken by the people was to destroy the tyrant.





government headed Cleomenes could meet with willing acquiescence, except under some temporary excitement. At first doubtless the popularity of the tyrants—combined with the terror of his persons and the vigilance or intervention of opponents, and further enhanced by the punishment of rich opponents—was sufficient to procure for him obedience; and prudence on his part might prolong this undisturbed rule for a considerable period, perhaps even throughout his whole life. But Aristotle intimates that these governments, even when they began well, had a constant tendency to become worse and worse. Discontent manifested itself, and was aggravated rather than repressed by the violence employed against it, until at length the despot became a prey to mistrustful and unrelenting anxiety, leaving any measure of equity or benevolent sympathy which might otherwise be expected from him. If he was fortunate enough to begeth his authority to his son, the latter, educated in a corrupt atmosphere and surrounded by parasites, contracted dispositions yet more vicious and unocial. His youthful egotisms were more ungovernable, while he was deficient in the prudence and vigour which had been indispensable to the self-accomplished rule of his father.<sup>1</sup> For each a position, marshy guards and a fortified acropolis were the only stay—guards fed at the expense of the citizens, and thus requiring constant exactions on behalf of that which was nothing better than a hostile garrison. It was essential to the security of the despot that he should keep down the spirit of the free people whom he governed; that he should isolate them from each other, and prevent those meetings and mutual communications which Spartan girls habitually presented in the school, the *Lanché*, or the *Palæstra*; that he should strike off the overtopping ears of corn in the field (to use the Greek locution) or smother the excited and enterprising minds.<sup>2</sup> Nay, he had even to

Constant  
between  
the tyrant  
and the  
people breeds  
distrust  
and the  
foundation of  
the empire.

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, *Polit.* c. 4, § 6. The whole tenor of this chapter characterises the tyrants as men who are governed more by personal passions than by any real sense of the good of the State.

<sup>2</sup> The *tyrannical* character of Athens is described by Aristotle, *Polit.* c. 4, § 6, and c. 5, § 1.

<sup>3</sup> Aristotle, *Polit.* c. 4, § 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Plutarch, *Life of Cleomenes*, c. 10, c. 11, c. 12, c. 13, c. 14, c. 15, c. 16, c. 17, c. 18, c. 19, c. 20, c. 21, c. 22, c. 23, c. 24, c. 25, c. 26, c. 27, c. 28, c. 29, c. 30, c. 31, c. 32, c. 33, c. 34, c. 35, c. 36, c. 37, c. 38, c. 39, c. 40, c. 41, c. 42, c. 43, c. 44, c. 45, c. 46, c. 47, c. 48, c. 49, c. 50, c. 51, c. 52, c. 53, c. 54, c. 55, c. 56, c. 57, c. 58, c. 59, c. 60, c. 61, c. 62, c. 63, c. 64, c. 65, c. 66, c. 67, c. 68, c. 69, c. 70, c. 71, c. 72, c. 73, c. 74, c. 75, c. 76, c. 77, c. 78, c. 79, c. 80, c. 81, c. 82, c. 83, c. 84, c. 85, c. 86, c. 87, c. 88, c. 89, c. 90, c. 91, c. 92, c. 93, c. 94, c. 95, c. 96, c. 97, c. 98, c. 99, c. 100.











Athens a short time before the Persian war, as a development of the seed planted by Solon.

As far as our imperfect information enables us to trace, these early oligarchies of the Grecian states, against which the first usurping despots contended, contained in themselves more regular elements of inequality, and more mischievous barriers between the component parts of the population, than the oligarchies of later days. What was true of Hellas as an aggregate, was true, though in a less degree, of each separate community which went to compose that aggregate. Each included a variety of clans, orders, religious brotherhoods, and local or professional societies, very imperfectly cemented together: so that the oligarchy was not (like the governments descended in subsequent times) the government of a rich few over the less rich and the poor, but that of a peculiar order, sometimes a Patrician order, over all the remaining society. In such a case the subject Many might number opulent and substantial proprietors as well as the governing Few; but these subject Many would themselves be broken into different heterogeneous fractions not heartily sympathizing with each other, perhaps not laboring under the same name of the same religious rites. The country-population, or villagers who tilled the land, seem in these early times to have been held to a painful dependence on the great proprietors who lived in the fortified towns, and to have been distinguished by a dress and habits of their own, which often drew upon them an unfriendly misrecognition. These town proprietors often composed the governing class in early Grecian states; while their subjects consisted—1. Of the dependent cultivators living in the district around, by whom their lands were tilled. 2. Of a certain number of small self-working proprietors (*hectored*), whose possessions were too scanty to maintain more than themselves by the labour of their own hands on their own plot of ground—raising either in the country or the town, as the case might be. 3. Of those who lived in the towns, having not land, but exercising handicraft, art, or commerce.

The governing proprietors went by the name of the *Heimari*, or *Gheimari*, according as the Doric or Ionic dialect might be used in describing them, since they were found in states belonging

to one race as well as to the other. They appear to have constituted a class, order, transmitting their privileges to their children, but admitting no new members to a participation. The principle called by Greek scholars a *Timocracy* (the enjoyment of political rights and privileges according to comparative property) seems to have been little, if at all, applied in the earlier times. We know no example of it earlier than Solon. So that by the natural multiplication of families and division of property, there would come to be many individual Greeks possessing no land at all,<sup>1</sup> and perhaps worse off than those small freeholders who did not belong to the order; while some of these latter freeholders, and some of the artisans and traders in the towns, might at the same time be rising in wealth and importance.

Greek term of the *Timocracy*—a class order of privileges according to property.

Under a political classification such as this, of which the repulsive inequality was aggravated by a rude state of manners, and which had no flexibility to meet the changes in relative position amongst individual individuals, discontent and strife were inevitable. The earliest despot, usually a wealthy man of the distracted class, became champion and leader of the malcontents.<sup>2</sup> However oppressive his rule might be, at least it was an oppression which bore with indiscriminate severity upon all the fractions of the population; and when the hour of reaction against him or against his successor arrived, so that the common enemy was expelled by the united efforts of all, it was hardly possible to revive the pre-existing system of exclusion and inequality without some considerable alterations.

As a general rule, every Greek city-community included in its population, independent of bought slaves, the three classes of elements above noticed,—considerable land-proprietors the people, with rustic dependents, small self-working proprietors, and town-artisans,—the three elements being found everywhere in different proportions. But the progress of events in Greece, from the seventh century B.C. downwards, tended continually to divert the comparative importance of the two latter; while in those early days the ascendancy of the former was at its maximum, and

<sup>1</sup> Like various symptoms of the Polish or Hungarian nobility in recent times.

<sup>2</sup> Thucyd. i. 32.

devoted only to defence. The military force of most of the cities was at first in the hands of the great proprietors, and forced by them. It consisted of cavalry, themselves and their retainers, with horses fed upon their lands. Such was the primitive oligarchical militia, as constituted in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.,<sup>1</sup> at Chalcis and Eretria in Euboea, as well as at Kolophon and other cities in Ionia, and as it continued in Thessaly down to the fourth century B.C. But the gradual rise of the small proprietors and town-artisans was marked by the substitution of heavy-armed infantry in place of cavalry. Moreover a further change not less

Place of the heavy armed in the early and of the free military militia—both no longerable in it. strictly.

Dorian  
militia—  
Dorian and  
non-Dorian  
militia.  
both.

important took place, when the resistance to Persia led to the great multiplication of Greek ships of war, manned by a host of seamen who dwelt congregated in the maritime towns. All these movements in the Greek communities tended to break up the close and exclusive oligarchies with which our first historical knowledge commences; and to conduct them, either to oligarchies rather more open, embracing all men of a certain amount of property—or else to democracies. But the transition in both cases was usually attained through the interlude of the despot.

In summarizing the distinct and heterogeneous elements of which the population of these early Greek communities was made up, we must not forget one further element which was to be found in the Dorian states generally—men of Dorian, as contrasted with men of non-Dorian, race. The Dorians were in all cases intriguers and conquerors, establishing themselves along with and at the expense of the prior inhabitants. Upon what terms the co-habitation was established, and in what proportions Dorians and invaded ones together—we have little information. Important as this circumstance is in the history of these Dorian communities, we know it only as a general fact, without being able to follow its results in detail. But we see enough to satisfy ourselves that in those revolutions which overthrew the oligarchies both at Corinth and Sikyon—perhaps also at Megara—the Dorians

<sup>1</sup> *Antiqu. Pers.* iv. c. 2, § 12. M. Hecataeus, *Fragmenta* = *Historia miculorum*, *Antiqu. Pers.* *Fragmenta*. ed. p. 112, *Strabo*, v. p. 282.





We learn from the narrative of Herodotus that the tribe to which Kleonarchus<sup>1</sup> himself (and of course his progenitors Orthagoras and the other Orthagorids also) belonged, was distinct from the three Doric tribes, who have been already named in my previous chapter respecting the Lykoneia constitution of  
 violent  
 present-  
 stage of  
 Kleonarchus  
 186  
 Sparta—the Hyllidæ, Parrhasidæ, and Dymaneæ. We also learn that these tribes were inimical to the Sikyonians and the Argives. Kleonarchus, being in a state of bitter hostility with Argos, tried in several ways to abolish the potency of community between the two Sikyons, originally decided by settlers from Argos, was included in the "lot of Timonæ," or among the homes of the Argive confederacy. The substance of this confederacy had become weaker and weaker, partly without doubt through the influence of the predecessors of Kleonarchus; but the Argives may perhaps have tried to revive it, thus placing themselves in a state of war with the latter, and inducing him to disconnect palpably and violently Sikyons from Argos. There were two anchors by which the connection held—first, legendary and religious sympathy; next, the civil rites and demonstrations current among the Sikyonian Dorians: both of these were torn up by Kleonarchus. He changed the names both of the three Doric tribes, and of that non-Doric tribe to which he himself belonged: the last he called by the complimentary title of *Archidæi* (commanders of the people); the first three he styled by the insulting names of *Hylææ*, *Oronææ*, and *Chironææ*, from the three Greek words signifying: a bear, an ox, and a little pig. The extreme bitterness of such an insult can only be appreciated when we know to measure the reverence with which the tribes in a Greek city regarded the hero from whom their name was borrowed. That these new designations, given by Kleonarchus, involved an intentional degradation of the Doric tribes as well as an assumption of superiority for his own, is affirmed by Herodotus, and seems well deserving of note.

But the violence of which Kleonarchus was capable in his anti-Argive sympathy is manifested still more plainly in his proceedings with respect to the hero, Admetos, and to the legendary sentiment of the people. Scuffling has already been said to a

<sup>1</sup> Herod. i. 46.

former chapter<sup>1</sup> about this remarkable incident, which must however be here again briefly noticed. The hero Admetus, whose chapel Hierophanes himself saw in the Sikyonian apse, was common both to Argos and to Sikyon, and was the object of special reverence at both. He figures in the legend as king of Argos, and as the grandson and heir of Polybus king of Sikyon. He was the unhappy leader of the two armies of Thibos, as famous in the ancient ages. The Sikyonians listened with delight both to the exploits of the Argives against Thibos, as celebrated in the recitations of the special rhapsodes, and to the successful tale of Admetus and his family sufferings, as sung in the tragic choros. Kleisthenes not only forbade the rhapsodes to come to Sikyon, but further contrived to expel Admetus himself from the country—such is the literal Greek expression,<sup>2</sup> the hero himself being believed to be actually present and distressed among the people. He first applied to the Delphian oracle for permission to carry this banishment into direct effect; but the Pythian priestess returned an answer of indignant refusal,—“Admetus is king of the Sikyonians, but thou art a ruffian.” Thus baffled, he put in practice a stratagem calculated to induce Admetus to depart of his own accord.<sup>3</sup> He went to Thibos to beg that he might be allowed to introduce into Sikyon the hero Melanippe; and the permission was granted. Now Melanippe—being celebrated in the legend as the patient champion of Thibos against Admetus and the Argive hostagers, and as having slain both Mithras the brother, and Tydore the son-in-law, of Admetus—was pre-eminently odious to the latter. Kleisthenes brought this anti-national hero into Sikyon, alleging to him unassailable ground in the *prytaneion* or government-house, and even in that part which was most strongly fortified<sup>4</sup> (for it seems that Admetus was considered as fitly to dwell and to battle with the intruder); moreover he took away both the tragic choros and the sacrifices from Admetus, comparing the former to the god Dionysos, and the latter to Melanippe.

The religious manifestations of Sikyon being thus transferred

<sup>1</sup> See above, Part I. ch. vi.

<sup>2</sup> *Thyrt. v. 10.* *Thibos* *Apollon* *Admetus* *Kleisthenes*, *Thibos* *Apollon*, *Admetus* *Kleisthenes*.

<sup>3</sup> *Thyrt. v. 10.* *Thibos* *Apollon* *Admetus*.

of which *Admetus* *Kleisthenes*.

<sup>4</sup> *Thyrt. v. 10.* *Thibos* *Apollon* *Admetus* *Kleisthenes*, *Thibos* *Apollon*, *Admetus* *Kleisthenes*, *Thibos* *Apollon*, *Admetus* *Kleisthenes*, *Thibos* *Apollon*, *Admetus* *Kleisthenes*.

from Adrianus to his mortal foe, and from the mass of Argives in the scope of Thebes to that of the Thebans, Adrianus was presumed to have voluntarily retired from the field. And the purpose which Kleisthenes contemplated, of breaking the community of feeling between Sikyon and Argos, was in part accomplished.

A ruler who could do such violence to the religious and  
 classes  
 of Sikyon  
 and Argos  
 was presum-  
 ably  
 supposed capable of inflicting that deliberate insult  
 upon the Dorian tribes which is implied in their new  
 appellations. As we are unenformed, however, of the state of  
 things which preceded, we know not how far it may have been a  
 retaliation for previous insult in the opposite direction. It is  
 plain that the Dorians of Sikyon maintained themselves and  
 their ancient tribes quite apart from the remaining community;  
 though what the other constituent portions of the population  
 were, or in what relation they stood to these Dorians, we are not  
 enabled to make out. We hear indeed of a dependent rural  
 population on the territory of Sikyon, as well as in that of Argos  
 and Epidaurea, analogous to the *Hikoi* in Laconia. In Sikyon  
 this class was termed the *Korymbophoroi* (stick-men) or the *Kutono-*  
*kophoroi*, from the stick wooden mantle which they wore, with a  
*chapeira* worn on to the skirt: in Argos they were called *Ophe-*  
*phoroi*, from their not possessing the military panoply or the use  
 of regular arms: in Epidaurea, *Kontophoroi* or the *Dusty-footed*.<sup>1</sup>  
 We may conclude that a similar class existed in Corinth, in  
 Megara, and in each of the Dorian towns of the Argolis Akra.  
 But besides the Dorian tribes and these rustic, there must  
 probably have existed non-Dorian proprietors and town-residents,  
 and upon them we may suppose that the power of the Orthagorides  
 and of Kleisthenes was founded, perhaps more firmly and  
 indulgent to the rustic sort than that of the Dorians had been  
 previously. The moderation which Aristotle ascribes to the  
 Orthagorides generally is belied by the proceedings of Kleisthenes.  
 But we may probably believe that his preferences, consistent with  
 maintaining the real predominance of the non-Dorian over the

<sup>1</sup> *Julian Pollux*, vi. 44; *Plutarch*,  
*Quæst. Græc.* n. l. p. 161; *Strabo*,  
*Geogr.* viii. p. 171; *Strabo*,  
*Geogr.* viii. p. 171; *Strabo*,  
*Geogr.* viii. p. 171.

As an instance in this sense of  
 Kleisthenes, we may notice the violent  
 attack of justice called *Choreia* of the  
*Protagoras*, of *Theophrastus* n. l. p. 161.



old was then revived in Sicily, since it existed in the time of Herodotus.

Of the war which Kleisthenes helped to conduct against Sikya, for the protection of the Delphian temple, I shall speak in another place. His death and the cessation of his dynasty seem to have occurred about 580 B.C., as far as the chronology can be made out.<sup>1</sup> That he was put down by the Spartans (as E. F. Hermann, O. Müller, and Dr. Thirlwall suppose)<sup>2</sup> can be hardly admitted consistently with the narrative of Herodotus, who mentions the continuance of the tyralling nation imposed by him upon the Dorians so late for many years after his death. Now, had the Spartans forcibly interfered for the suppression of his dynasty, we may reasonably presume that, even if they did not restore the decided preponderance of the Dorians in Sicily, they would at least have rescued the Dorian tribes from this obnoxious tyranny. But it

<sup>1</sup> The chronology of Kleisthenes and his dynasty is perplexing. The most authoritative reference is Herod. ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1, and this must be worked back the beginning of Kleisthenes to a period between 580-570. From we are told by Aristotle that the native dynasty lasted 100 years, but it would have lasted probably somewhat longer for the death of Kleisthenes was hardly to place the beginning of his reign. The war against Sikya (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) and the Persian victory (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) within his reign, and the marriage of his daughter Agasthenes with Megakles son of Kleon (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) as well as the death of Kleisthenes (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) are all events which must be placed within the reign of Kleisthenes. The war against Sikya (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) and the Persian victory (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) are all events which must be placed within the reign of Kleisthenes. The war against Sikya (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) and the Persian victory (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) are all events which must be placed within the reign of Kleisthenes.

Agasthenes was the son of that Agasthenes who had married the daughter of the Dorians of Sikya (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) and the Persian victory (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) are all events which must be placed within the reign of Kleisthenes. The war against Sikya (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) and the Persian victory (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) are all events which must be placed within the reign of Kleisthenes.

extended from 580-570 B.C., and his deposition in the middle of 570 B.C. appears to have taken place about 570 B.C. If this chronology be adopted, the marriage of Agasthenes with the daughter of the tyrant Kleisthenes must have taken place about 570 B.C. The war against Sikya (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) and the Persian victory (ad. Siculorum lib. ii. c. 1) are all events which must be placed within the reign of Kleisthenes.

But I shall now give a full account of the reign of Kleisthenes, when I discuss the history of the Dorians of Sikya and the Dorians of Sikya. I shall now give a full account of the reign of Kleisthenes, when I discuss the history of the Dorians of Sikya and the Dorians of Sikya. I shall now give a full account of the reign of Kleisthenes, when I discuss the history of the Dorians of Sikya and the Dorians of Sikya.

<sup>2</sup> Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, vol. i. ch. 1. p. 381, 382, 383.



be connected with the history of Elisian rule as given in Herodotus, we are unable to say.

Contemporaneous with the Grilagorides in Sicily—but beginning a little later and closing somewhat earlier—we find the despots Kypselos and Pankalos at Corinth.<sup>1</sup> The former appears as the substrate of the dynasty called the Bacchiads. Of the manner in which he accomplished his object we find no information; and this historical blank is inadequately filled up by various religious prophecies and oracles, foreshadowing the rise, the harsh rule, and the downfall, after two generations, of these powerful despots.

According to us here deeply seated in the Greek mind, the destruction of a great prince or of a great power is usually signified by the gods beforehand, though either through hardness of heart or inadvertence no heed is taken of the warning. In reference to Kypselos and the Bacchiads, we are informed that Nikes, the ancestor of the former, was one of the original settlers at Corinth who accompanied the first Doric chief Alkios, and that Alkios was in vain warned by an oracle not to admit him.<sup>2</sup> Again too, immediately before Kypselos was born, the Bacchiads received notice that his mother was about to give birth to one who would prove their ruin: the dangerous subject escaped destruction only by a hair's breadth, being preserved from the instant of his destruction by lucky concealment in a chest. Lakle, the mother of Kypselos, was daughter of Amphilois, who belonged to the gens or sept of the Bacchiads; but she was lame, and none of the gens would consent to marry her with that deficiency. Eteios, son of Bokhoratos, who became her husband, belonged to a different, yet hardly less distinguished, heroic genealogy. He was of the Lagrides, descended from Ereos, and dwelling in the Christianion deme called Petra. We see then that Kypselos was not only a high-born man in the city, but a Bacchiad by half-blood: both of these circumstances were likely to make enemies from the government intolerable to him. He rendered himself highly popular with the people, and by their aid overthrew and expelled the Bacchiads, continuing as despot at Corinth for

<sup>1</sup> *Paros*, B. 1. 2.

thirty years until his death (B.C. 630—620). According to Aristotle, he maintained throughout life the same conciliatory behaviour by which his power had first been acquired; and his popularity was so officially sustained that he had never any occasion for a body-guard. But the Corinthian oligarchy of the century of Hieronides (whose tale that historian has entailed on the action of the Corinthian navy *hulkidai* to the Spartans) gave a very different description, and depicted Kyprianos as a cruel ruler, who banished, robbed, and murdered by wholesale.

His son and successor Perikles, though energetic as a warrior, distinguished as an encouragee of poetry and music, Perikles and even numbered by some among the seven wise men of Greece, is nevertheless uniformly represented as oppressive and tyrannical in his treatment of subjects. The revolting stories which are told respecting his private life, and his relations with his mother and his wife, may for the most part be regarded as calumnies suggested by odious associations with his memory. But there seems good reason for imputing to him tyranny of the worst character. The imaginary maxims of protection, so often acted upon by Greek despots, were traced back in ordinary belief to Perikles<sup>1</sup> and his contemporary Themistokles, despot of Miletus. He maintained a powerful body-guard, shed much blood, and was excitable in his emotions, a part of which was employed in votive offerings at Olympia. Such manifestations to the gods was considered by Aristotle and others as part of a barbarous system, with the view of keeping his subjects both hard at work and poor. On one occasion we are told that he invited the women of Corinth to assemble for the celebration of a religious festival, and then stripped them of their rich attire and ornaments. By some later writers he is pointed out as the stern foe of everything like luxury and dissolute habits—encouraging industry, compelling every man to render account of his means of livelihood, and causing the poorhouse of Corinth to be thrown into the sea.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, *Polit.* v. 2, 35. Hieronides, v. 16. The last connecting Kyprianos and his tyrannical character with the people connected in the opening passage here of the *Memories of Aristotle*, coincides with the general view of Hieronides (Aristotle, *Memories*, B. 1, 1, 1) in not only the statements of the biographer but also of the same or

several authorities.

<sup>2</sup> Aristotle, *Polit.* v. 2, 3—35; B. 2, 2, 1. Hieronides, v. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Hieronides, *Polit.* 10, 11, 12. Hieronides, *Memories*, *Polit.* 2, 11. Hieronides, *Memories*, *Polit.* 2, 11. Hieronides, *Polit.* 1, 1, 1. Hieronides, v. 16.



Though the general features of his character, his cruel tyranny no less than his vigour and ability, may be sufficiently noted in, yet the particular incidents connected with his name are all extremely *dykaios*. The most creditable of all seems to be the tale of his insupportable quarrel with his son and his brutal treatment of many noble Eorkyran youths, as related in Herodotus. Periander is said to have put to death his wife Melissa, daughter of Praxias, despot of Epikouron. His son Lykophron, informed of this deed, contracted an invincible antipathy against him. Periander, after vainly trying both by rigour and by conciliation to conquer this feeling on the part of his son, sent him to reside at Eorkyra, then dependant upon his rule: but when he found himself growing old and disabled, he recalled him to Corinth, in order to ensure the continuance of the dynasty. Lykophron still obstinately declined all personal communication with his father, upon which the latter deemed him to come to Corinth, and engaged himself to go over to Eorkyra. So terrified were the Eorkyrans at the idea of a visit from this formidable old man, that they put Lykophron to death—a deed which Periander avenged by sending three hundred youths of their noblest families, and sending them over to the Lydian king Alyattes at Sardis, in order that they might be entrusted and made to serve as *amouchi*. The Corinthian vessels in which the youths were despatched fortunately touched at Sicily in the way; where the Samians and Knakians, shocked at a proceeding which outraged all Hellenic sentiment, contrived to rescue the youths from the miserable fate intended for them, and after the death of Periander sent them back to their native island.<sup>1</sup>

While we turn with displeasure from the political life of this man, we are at the same time much surprised with the great extent of his power—greater than that which was ever possessed by Corinth after the extinction of his dynasty. Eorkyra, Ambrakia, Loukos, and Anaktorion, all Corinthian colonies, but in the next century independent states, appear in his time dependant on Corinth. Ambrakia is said to have been under the rule of another despot named Periander, probably also a Kypselid by birth. It seems

<sup>1</sup> Herodot. II. c. 123. He speaks of *perioikoi*, the Samian *Neokoroi*, and Knakian *Neokoroi*.—*See* II. c. 123.



well as by violent aggressions against the rich proprietors, whose estates he destroyed in their pastures by the side of the river. We are not told by what previous conduct on the part of the rich this hatred of the people had been earned; but Theophrastus carried the popular feeling completely along with him, obtained by public vote a body of guards ostensibly for his personal safety, and employed them to overthrown the oligarchy.<sup>1</sup> Yet he did not maintain his power even for his own life. A second revolution destroyed and expelled him, on which occasion, after a short interval of temporary government, the people were said to have renewed in a still more marked way their antipathies against the rich, banishing some of them with confiscation of property, intruding into the houses of others with demands for forced hospitality, and even passing a formal *Pallinoria*—or decree to require from the rich who had lent money on interest the refunding of all past interest paid to them by their debtors.<sup>2</sup> To appreciate correctly such a demand, we must recollect that the practice of taking interest for money lent was regarded by a large proportion of early ancient society with feelings of unqualified reprobation. And it will be seen, when we come to the legislation of Solon, how much such violent reactionary feeling against the creditor was provoked by the unrelenting working of the harsh law determining his rights.

We hear in general terms of more than one revolution in the government of Megara—a disorderly democracy subverted by returning oligarchical elites, and these again unable long to maintain themselves;<sup>3</sup> but we are alike unenlightened as to dates and details. And in respect to one of these struggles we are admitted to the outpourings of a contemporary and a witness—the Megarian poet Theophrastus. Unfortunately his elegant verses as we possess them are in a state so broken, incoherent, and interpolated, that we make out no distinct conception of the events which roll upon forth. Still here and there we discover in the verses of Theophrastus that strength and pendency of pure Doric feeling, which, since the publication of G. Müller's *History of the Dorians*, it has been

Described  
government  
in Doric—  
Theophrastus

<sup>1</sup> *Antiquities*, *Polis*, v. 2, 2; *Strabo*, i. 2, 2.  
<sup>2</sup> *Antiquities*, *Polis*, v. 2, 2; *Strabo*, i. 2, 2.  
<sup>3</sup> *Antiquities*, *Polis*, v. 2, 2; *Strabo*, i. 2, 2.

the fashion to look for so extensively. But we see that the poet was connected with an oligarchy of birth, and not of wealth, which had recently been subverted by the breaking in of the native population previously subject and degraded—that these subjects were content to submit to a single-headed despot, in order to escape from their former rulers—and that Thögers had himself been betrayed by his own friends and companions, stripped of his property and exiled, through the wrong-doing "of enemies whose blood he hopes one day to be permitted to drink."<sup>3</sup> The condition of the subject nations presents in this poem the same defects in and scheme: they "dwell without the city, clad in gauds, and ignorant of judicial sentences or laws"<sup>4</sup> after it, they had become strange, and their importance had been unaccountably enhanced. Thus (according to his impression) the vile breed has broken down the noble—the bad have become masters, and the good are no longer of any account. The bitterness and transgression which attend upon poverty, and the native ascendancy which wealth confers even upon the most worthless of mankind,<sup>5</sup> are among the prominent subjects of his complaint. His keen personal feeling on this point would be alone sufficient to show that the recent revolution had no way overthrown the influence of property; in contradiction to the opinion of Wulker, who infers without ground, from a passage of uncertain meaning, that the land of the state had been formally re-devided.<sup>6</sup> The Maypot revolution, so far as we can trace

<sup>1</sup> *Thymopressin*, see 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915,

THESE

1000

1. *Phylogenetic relationships* among the studied taxa were determined using the maximum parsimony method. The analysis was performed using the *PAUP* 4.0a software package (Nelson & OlSEN, 1992). The analysis was based on 1000 random addition sequence replicates and 1000 random addition sequence replicates. The analysis was based on 1000 random addition sequence replicates and 1000 random addition sequence replicates.

© 2008 Blackwell Publishing Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 263: 105–114

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

Table 1. Mean (SD) baseline characteristics of the study population.

1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 26

### Control the Programme, in Training, of Training, and

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

1. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1996, 33, 1, 1-14.

particularly valuable and full of information. He discusses in great length the land-use changes in Thailand with reference to the past, as well as the water and soil, and with reference to many different standards, but to which are contrasted with poverty—poverty with low birth—deaths, with overpopulation, with the agricultural culture, an appeal to lower birth rates, etc., etc. The various sources of these words is not clearly stated, but the picture of Thailand is gradually put up as a dismal, and indeed, pessimistic for the future, instead of a picture of a well-run country by its natives. But the many problems involved always remained, and the distinction between the two has been productive of (perhaps) misunderstanding. Greater attention is necessary when we read the comments of local



There existed a certain sympathy and alliance between the despots of Corinth and Sicyon;<sup>1</sup> how far such feeling was further extended to Megara, we do not know. The latter city seems evidently to have been more populous and powerful during the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. than we shall afterwards find her throughout the two brilliant centuries of Grecian history. Her colonies, based as far distant as Italy possessed the Thracian Bosphorus on one side, and as Sicily on the other, argue an extent of trade as well as moral force none not inferior to Athens; so that we shall be the less surprised when we approach the life of Solon, to find her in possession of the island of Salamis, and long maintaining it, at one time with every promise of triumph, against the entire force of the Athenians.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 15. 20.

## CHAPTER X.

## EASTERN PORTION OF HELLAS—ATHENS BEFORE SOLON.

HAVING traced in the preceding chapters the scanty stream of Peloponnesian history, from the first commencement of an authentic chronology in 776 B.C., to the maximum of Spartan territorial acquisition, and the general acknowledgement of Spartan primacy, prior to 547 B.C., I proceed to state as much as can be made out respecting the lesser portion of Hellas during the same period. This portion comprehends Athens and Eubœa,—the Cyclades Islands,—and the Ionian cities on the coast of Asia Minor, with their different colonies.

In the case of Peloponnesians, we have been enabled to discern something like an order of real facts in the period alluded to—Sparta makes great strides, while Argos falls. In the case of Athens, unfortunately, our materials are less instructive. The number of historical facts, anterior to the Solonian legislation, is very few indeed: the interval between 776 B.C. and 614 B.C., the epoch of Draco's legislation a short time prior to Xerxes's attempted usurpation, gives us merely a list of archons, devoided of all incident.

In compliment to the heroism of Kodrus, who had sacrificed his life for the safety of his country, we are told that no person after him was permitted to bear the title of king.<sup>1</sup> His son Medon, and twelve successors—Alkæon, Archippos, Thersippus, Phorbas, Megakles, Kleopatra, Phereklês, Antiphros, Thersippos, Agamemnon, Kleopatra, and Alkæon—were all archons for life. In the second year of Alkæon (718 B.C.), the dignity of archon was restricted to a duration of ten years: and seven of

History of  
Athens, by  
Herodotus  
—1857 &  
1858.  
See also  
Pausanias.

The king  
after the  
king, like  
archon,  
was called  
archon.  
second ap-  
pointment, after  
the archon.

<sup>1</sup> Pausan. 2. 1.

These ancestral archons are numbered—*Clarus*, *Heurystis*, *Kleisthenes*, *Hippomenes*, *Leokontis*, *Apseudes*, *Eryxios*. With *Kleos* who succeeded *Eryxios* the archonship was not only made annual, but put into commission and distributed among nine persons. These nine archons annually changed offices throughout all the historical period, interrupted only by the few intervals of political disturbance and foreign occupation. Down to *Kleisthenes* and *Hippomenes* (714 B.C.), the dignity of archon had continued to belong exclusively to the Melantes or descendants of *Melitos* and *Kleonymos*,<sup>1</sup> at that period it was thrown open to all the Eupatrids, or order of nobility in the state.

Such is the series of names by which we step down from the level of legend to that of history. All our historical knowledge of Athens is founded in the ancestral archons; which series of eponymous archons, from *Kleos* downwards, is perfectly trustworthy.<sup>2</sup> Above 650 B.C., the Attic antiquaries have provided us with a string of names, which we must take as we find them, without being able either to warrant the whole or to separate the false from the true. There is no reason to doubt the general fact that Athens, like so many other communities of Greece, was in its primitive times governed by an hereditary line of kings, and that it passed from that form of government into a commonwealth, first oligarchical, afterwards democratical.

We are in no condition to determine the civil classification and political constitution of Athens, even at the period of the archonship of *Kleos*, 1050 B.C., when authentic Athenian chronology first commences—much less can we pretend to any knowledge of the anterior centuries. Great political changes were introduced first by *Solon* (about 594 B.C.), next by *Kleisthenes* (508 B.C.), afterwards by *Aristides*, *Perikles*, and *Ephialtes*, between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars: so that the old ante-Solonian—nay even the real Solonian—polity was thus got more and more out of date and out of knowledge. Not all the information which we possess respecting that old polity is derived from authors who

Archonship  
of Athens,  
B.C. 1050.  
Continuation  
of  
Attic chron-  
ology.

<sup>1</sup> Pausan. i. 4. 1; Solon, *Fragment*; *Diogenes Laertius*, *Parasit.* iii. 1. *Strabo*, *Geograph.* viii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See *Chron.* of the *Parasit.* *Diogenes*, *Fragment*, *Strabo*, *Geograph.* viii. 1.

pp. 207, 212, 222.

From this beginning of the reign of *Melitos* say, as *Kleos*, in the first ancestral archon *Kleos*, the *Parasit.* *Diogenes* *Fragment*, *Strabo*, *Geograph.* viii. 1.



Even after all or most of these great changes—and who, finding no records, nor anything better than current legends, explained the functions as well as they could by guesswork, more or less ingenious, generally attached to the dominant legendary names. They were sometimes able to found their conclusions upon religious usages, periodical ceremonies, or common sacrifices, still subsisting in their own time. These were doubtless the best evidence to be found respecting Athenian antiquity, since such practices often continued unaltered throughout all the political changes. It is in this way alone that we arrive at some partial knowledge of the ante-Solonian constitution of Athens, though as a whole it still remains dark and unintelligible, even after the many illustrations of modern commentators.

Plutarchus, writing in the third century before the Christian era, stated, that Krokops had originally distributed Athens into twelve districts—Krokopia, Tetrapolia, Epakria, Dekheia, Ekroma, Aphakia, Theoklia, Eretria, Kythoria, Spilakia, Euphrasia, Psallia—and that these twelve were consolidated into one political society by Theseus.<sup>1</sup> This partition does not comprise the Megarid, which, according to other statements, is represented as united with Attika, and as having formed part of the distribution made by King Pandion among his four sons, These, Agropas, Pallas, and Lykos—a story as old as Sophokles at least.<sup>2</sup> In other accounts, again, a quadruple division is applied to the tribes, which are stated to have been four in number, beginning from Krokops—called in his time Krokopia, Arrokithia, Akria, and Psallia. Under King Erichon, these tribes (we are told) received the names of Erichon, Akria, Megara, and Dekheia<sup>3</sup>—under Erechthonius, those of Dike, Akheia, Psallakia, Hephestidia: at last, shortly after Erechthon, they were denominated after the four sons of Ilos (son of Erichon daughter of Erechthon, by Apollo), Gekomaia, Hoplitia, Agykhoris, Agapelaia. The four Attic or Ionic tribes, under these last-mentioned names, continued to

<sup>1</sup> Plutarchus *op. cit.* *loc. cit.* p. 104. See also *Strabo*, *lib. 9*, p. 404. *lib. 10*, p. 404. *lib. 11*, p. 404.

<sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, *lib. 9*, p. 404. Plutarchus and Aristotle retained the Megarid as

being from the possession of Theseus as far as the Propylæa near Akropolis and Akropolis (lib. 9, p. 404). There were many different tribes.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, *lib. 9*, p. 404–411.



All that seems certain is, that these were the four ancient Ionic tribes (analogous to the Hylææ, Pæophræti, and Dymææ among the Dorians) which prevailed not only at Athens, but among several of the Ionic cities derived from Athens. The *Colontes* are mentioned in inscriptions now remaining belonging to Teles in Ionia, and all the four are named in those of Erythra in the Propontis, which was a foundation from the Ionic Milesians.<sup>1</sup> The four tribes, and the four names (following for some variations of reading), are therefore historically verified. But neither the time of their introduction, nor their primitive import, are ascertainable matters; nor can any faith be put in the various constructions of the legends of *Iphæ*, *Neukthens*, and *Kekrops* by modern commentators.

These four tribes may be looked at either as religious and <sup>political</sup> social aggregations, in which equally each of them comprised three *Phratriæ* and ninety *Genæ*; or as political aggregations, in which point of view each included three *Trityes* and twelve *Neuktrones*. Each *Phratriæ* contained thirty *Genæ*: each *Trityes* comprised four *Neuktrones*: the total numbers were thus 360 *Genæ* and 48 *Neuktrones*. Moreover each *genæ* is said to have contained thirty heads of families, of whom therefore there would be a total of 10,800.

Comparing these two distributions one with the other, we may remark that they are distinct in their nature and proceed in opposite directions. The *Trityes* and the *Neuktrones* are essentially fractional subdivisions of the tribe, and resting upon the tribe as their higher unity: the *Neuktrones* is a local description, composed of the *Neuktrones* or principal households (so the etymology seems to indicate), who lay in each respective district the quota of public contributions which belongs to it, and experienced the disbursement,—provide the military force incumbent upon the district, being for each *neuktrones* two horsemen and one ship,—and furnish the

<sup>1</sup> *Strabo*, *Geogr. lib. 10*, p. 497, 498, 499. The following commentary on this last mentioned inscription, in which *Strabo* mentions the well-attested reality of the classification by *phratriæ*, is merely subsidiary to the point.

E. F. Rieu, *Antiquities of Athens*, vol. 1, p. 107.

*Strabo*, *Geogr. lib. 10*, p. 497, 498, 499. The following commentary on this last mentioned inscription, in which *Strabo* mentions the well-attested reality of the classification by *phratriæ*, is merely subsidiary to the point.





Each were the rights and obligations characterizing the gens or nation.<sup>1</sup> The phratry union, binding together several gentes, was less intimate, but still included some mutual rights and obligations of an analogous character; especially a communion of particular sacred rites, and mutual privileges of prosecution, in the case of a phratric being slain. Each phratry was considered as belonging to one of the four tribes, and all the phratries of the same tribe enjoyed a certain periodical communion of sacred rites, under the presidency of a magistrate called the *Phylax*-*Basileus* or *Tribe King*, selected from the *Eupatridæ*: *Ses* *Qeios* was in this manner the patron god of the tribe *Gelontes*. Lastly, all the four tribes were linked together by the common worship of *Apollis Patrolos* as their divine father and guardian; for *Apollis* was the father of *Ilos*, and the *Eponyms* of all the four tribes were counted sons of *Ilos*.

Thus stand the primitive religious and social union of the population of Africa in its gradually ascending scale—as distinguished from the political union, probably of later introduction, represented at first by the Tutsies and Ndururries, and in after times by the two Kikothesean tribes, subdivided into Tutsies and Demas. The religious and family bond of aggregation is the earlier of the two ; but the political bond, though beginning later, will be found to acquire constantly increasing influence throughout the greater part of this history. In the former, personal relation is the essential and predominant characteristic—local relation being subordinate : in the latter, property and residence become the chief considerations, and the personal element counts only as measured along with these accompaniments. All these phœnic and gætic associations, the larger as well as the smaller, were founded upon the same principle and tendency of the German mind—a consequence of the idea of weakness with that of

1 See the instructive inscription, in Fournier-Ross's work (citing the source, on p. 103), p. 51, of the year 1890, *Spawville, Pennsylvania*, the friends of Paul Ross, the great of Europe, the friends of America, and the friends of the world, with the same last letter of each individual. (Fournier-Ross, in the same, p. 103, p. 51.) About the popular religious class of the year called *Spawville*, see *Spawville*, p. 51.

<sup>1</sup> Updated version appeared in *Journal of Management*, 2006, 32(1), 1-19.

[illegible]

















There is one remarkable difference between the Roman and the German gens, arising from the different practice in regard to naming. A Roman Patronym has habitually three names—the gentile name, with one name follow-<sup>ing it to denote his family, and another preceding it peculiar to himself in that family.</sup> But in Athens, at least after the revolution of Kleisthenes, the gentile name was not employed: a man was described by his own single name, followed first by the name of his father and next by that of the deme to which he belonged, *—as* *Alcibiades, son of Alcibiades, a Kleisthenid.* Such a difference in the habitual system of naming tended to make the gentile less more present to every such mind at Rome than in the Greek cities.

Before the promiscuous classification of the Athenians introduced by Solon, the *Phratry* and *Gentes*, and the *Tribe* and *Neokhorie*, were the only recognized heads among them, and the only basis of legal rights and obligations, over and above the natural family. The gens constituted a close incorporation, both as to property and as to persons. Until the time of Solon, no man had any power of testamentary disposition. If he died without children, his nearest agnates succeeded to his property,\* and as they continued to do even after Solon, if he died intestate. An orphan girl might be claimed in marriage of right by any member of the gens, the nearest agnates being preferred;† if she was poor, and he did not choose to marry her himself, the law of Solon compelled him to provide her with a dowry proportional to his enriched scale of property, and to give her out in marriage to another; and

rights and obligations of the gens and private individuals.

Dr. Marshall, in his history of Athens, shows that these institutions are analogous to those, including an original promiscuous descent, and using the primary institution of marriage as a basis, or of a house having the name of its captain, as the same ones (Marshall, *loc. cit.* and *Marshall's Institutions for the Middle Ages*, vol. i. p. 22).

In other descriptions from the island of Euboea, published by Professor Ross, we have a more complicated system, supposed of more advanced period. It is here of separate blood lines, but dependent on female lines,

a tribe gentile, and a private promiscuous, including, *Antiklathron, Antiklathron, Antiklathron*. (Ross, *loc. cit.* and *Marshall's Institutions*, vol. i. p. 22, *loc. cit.* 184.) This is a specimen of the system substantially introduced by Kleisthenes in Athens.

\* Marshall, *loc. cit.* p. 22. We find a person, named *Antiklathron*, being in the gens and testamentary heir of Kleisthenes, *loc. cit.* p. 184; *Marshall's Institutions*, vol. i. p. 22.

† Marshall, *loc. cit.* p. 184. See the singular additional provision in Aristotle, *loc. cit.* p. 184.







The *demos*, instead of the *naukrury*, became the elementary political division, for military and financial objects; while the *demarch* became the working local president, instead of the chief of the *naukrury*. The *demos*, however, was not coincident with a *naukrury*, nor the *demarch* with the previous chief of the *naukrury*, though they were analogous and constituted for the like purposes.<sup>1</sup> While the *naukruries* had been only forty-eight in number, the *demos* formed smaller subdivisions, and (in later times at least) amounted to a hundred and twenty-four.<sup>2</sup>

But though this early quadruple-division into tribes is intrinsically intelligible in itself, there is much difficulty in reconciling it with that anomaly of government which we learn to have originally prevailed among the inhabitants of Attica. From Ekrope-*dores* in Thibron (says Thucydides) there were many different cities in Attica, each of them autonomous and self-governing, with its own *prytaneion* and its own archons. It was only on occasions of some common danger that these distinct communities took counsel together under the authority of the Athenian kings, whose city at that time occupied nearly the holy rock of Akropolis on the plain<sup>3</sup> (afterwards so conspicuous as the acropolis of the enlarged Athens), together with a narrow area under it on the southern side. It was Thibron (he states) who effected that great revolution whereby the whole of Attica was consolidated into one government—all the local magistracies and councils being made to centre in the *prytaneion* and senate of Athens. He conferred equality and power undivided upon all the inhabitants of Attica, the necessity of prosecuting Athens as the one city in

<sup>1</sup> The language of Ptolemy on this matter is, however, not so definite as it appears, and I have endeavored to make it as clear as I can. It is worth noting that thus at Akropolis, who identifies the two divisions—*i. e. Akropolis*. It is to be noted that the *naukruries* were confined under the *prytaneion* conditions, while the *demos* had their own government in their own right. For in every *naukrureion* city, they must probably have been confined to such areas without any real efficiency or freedom. Thucydides makes this statement, and Aristotle

idem in *Politica* (History of Athens, I. c. 10, 11, 12, p. 100), and I cannot but doubt his statements. For the same time, it is a *naukrureion* which was actually founded and was a working organization. Thucydides (L. c. 10, p. 100), and it seems hardly probable that such should be the description of Athens, and representing the whole part, the whole the *ekklesia* of the *naukrureion*.

<sup>2</sup> Thucydides, II. c. 10, p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> Thucydides, II. c. 10, p. 100, where he states *naukrureion* *ekklesia*. Thucydides, II. c. 10, p. 100, where he states *ekklesia* *ekklesia*.

the country, and of occupying their own shores simply as convenient portions of Athenian territory. This important move, which naturally produced a great extension of the control city, was commemorated throughout the historical times by the Athenians in the particular festival called *Synaxis*, in honour of the goddess *Athina*.<sup>2</sup>

Such is the account which Thucydides gives of the original severity and subsequent conciliation of the different portions of Attica. Of the general fact there is no reason to doubt, though the operative cause assigned by the historian—the power and sagacity of Theseus—belongs to legend and not to history. Nor can we pretend to determine either the real steps by which such a change was brought about, or its date, or the number of portions which went to constitute the full grown *Attika*—Athena enlarged at some early period, though we do not know when, by voluntary junction of the Eleusian or west-Eleusian town Eleuthera, situated among the valleys of Ilissus between Eleusis and Plataeae. It was the standing label of the population of Attica, even down to the Peloponnesian war,<sup>1</sup> to reside in their several metrons, where their ancient festivals and temples yet continued as relics of a state of previous autonomy. Their visits to the city were made only at special times, for purposes religious or political, and they still looked upon the country residence as their real home. How deep-rooted this national feeling was among them, we may see by the fact that it

<sup>1</sup> Long afterwards, at the time of the Peloponnesian war.

survived the temporary exile forced upon them by the Pandemic invasion, and was rewarded when the expulsion of that destroying host enabled them to rebuild their ruined dwellings as a town.<sup>4</sup>

How many of the donors recognized by Kleibenstein had originally entered arrangements or in what local associations?

<sup>1</sup>Thayer, R. M., Thompson, Charles W., & Fitch, William W. give the proceedings of William's funeral service, and with a description of the funeral.

[illegible]

The Albanians transferred from Macedonia to Albania with a reasonable status of citizens and a religious community in Albania. The transfer of the Albanians from Macedonia

stated by Friedman to have taken place in consequence of the fact, or the existence of "Tollies," and might have occurred before 1811 and, third, which period we first begin to see the transfer from of *salix glauca*, 8, 79, 10, 120.

Theresa, E. M. M. after the 1918-1919 influenza pandemic, and her husband, George, who was born in 1880, was the first to be buried in the cemetery.



of that goddess to Eleusis after the abduction of her daughter, and the first establishment of the Eleusinian ceremonies, specifies the spontaneous spring Eleusa, and the various chiefs of the place—Kakos, Triptolemos, Iakchos, and Demeter. It also notices the Eleusinian plain in the neighbourhood of Eleusis. But not the least allusion is made to Athens or to any concern of the Athenians in the presence or worship of the goddess. There is reason to believe that at the time when this hymn was composed, Eleusis was an independent town: what that time was, we have no means of settling, though You puts it as low as the 39th Olympiad.<sup>1</sup> And the proof hence derived is so much the more valuable, because the hymn to Demeter presents a coloring strictly special and local: moreover the story told by Solon to Croesus, respecting Tellos the Athenian who perished in battle against the neighboring townsmen of Eleusis,<sup>2</sup> confirms in like manner the independence of the latter in earlier times. Nor will it be important to notice, that even as low as 300 B.C. the observant satirist Diogenes professes to detect a difference between the native Athenians and the Atticans, as well in physiognomy as in character and taste.<sup>3</sup>

In the history set forth to us of the proceedings of Theseus, no mention is made of these four Ionic tribes; but another and a totally different distribution of the people into Egeptrides, Godmoet, and Demurgæ, which he is said to have first separated, introduced, is brought to our notice: Dionysius of Halicarnassus gives only a double division—Egeptrides and Godmoet-tribes and dependent cultivators; corresponding to his idea of the patricians and clients in early Rome.<sup>4</sup> As far as we can understand this triple distribution, it seems to be separate and unconnected with the four tribes above-mentioned. The Egeptrides are the wealthy and powerful men, belonging to the most distinguished families in all the various parts, and principally living in the city of Athens, after the consolidation of Attica: from them are distinguished the middling and lower people, simply classified into husbandmen and artisans. To the Egeptrides is ascribed a religious as well as a political and social

<sup>1</sup> E. You, *Hellenismos*, p. 1; *Antiquities*, ii. 22, 23; *Plutarch*, *Theseus*, c. 12. *Strabo*, xii. p. 495. *Herodotus*, i. 16.

<sup>2</sup> *Diogenes*, *The Greeks*, p. 161, *Fragment*, 11, 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Diogenes*, *Theseus*, c. 12. *Strabo*, xii. p. 495.



authority, originally by the side of the kings and afterwards by the side of the archbishops. It would then of course be known by the title of *My Devil—The senate or council*; its distinctive title, "*Senate of Arizapague*" (inferred from the place where its sittings were held) would not be bestowed until the formation by Saldaña of the second senate or council, from which there was need to distinguish it.

This seems to explain the reason why it was never mentioned in the willances of Ducha, whose officers supplied our argument in favour of the opinion that it did not exist in his time, and that it was first constituted by Saldaña.<sup>1</sup> We hear of the senate of Arizapague chiefly as a judicial tribunal, because it acted in this character constantly throughout Aztecian history, and because the masters have most frequent occasion to allude to its decisions on matters of trial. But its functions were originally of the widest consular character, directive generally as well as judicial. And although the gradual increase of democracy at Aztec (as will be hereafter explained) both shrivelled its power and contributed still further comparatively to lower it, by enlarging the direct working of the people in assembly and judicature, as well as that of the senate of Five Hundred, which was a permanent adjunct and auxiliary of the public assembly—yet it seems to have been, even down to the time of Pizarro, the most important body in the state. And after it had been cast into the background by the political reforms of that great man, we still find it on particular occasions stepping forward to reassert its ancient powers, and to assume for the moment that undisturbed interference which it had enjoyed without dispute in antiquity. The attachment of the Aztecs to their ancient institutions gave to the senate of Arizapague a constant and powerful hold on their minds, and this feeling was rather strengthened than weakened when it ceased to be an agent of popular justice—when it could no longer be employed as an auxiliary of oligarchical pretensions.

Of the *great synods*, whose number continued unaltered from 600 A.D. to the end of the free democracy, three bore the same special titles—the *Archean Episcopate*, from whose <sup>the same</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>senate</sup> ~~their~~ <sup>the</sup> came the designation of the pair was derived, and *Saldaña*.

<sup>1</sup> *Historia, Saldaña, c. 18; 2. c. 10. Saldaña first instituted the senate of 500 A. D. 1; 2. c. 10. See also, 1. c. 10. Arizapague 4. c. 10.*  
<sup>2</sup> There seems to follow the opinion that



general law being concerned only in its application to some particular case. Deakins was the first Thomassin who was called upon to set down his Thomassin in writing, and thus to invest them essentially with a character of more or less generality.

In the later and better-known times of Assyrian law, we find these arbors degraded to great measure of their powers of judging and deciding, and restricted to the task of first hearing the parties and collecting the evidence, next, of introducing the matter for trial into the appropriate district, over which they presided. But originally there was no separation of powers; the arbors both judged and administered, sharing among themselves those privileges which had once been united in the hands of the king, and probably acceptable at the end of their year of office to the senate of Ansuppaka. It is probable also that the functions of that senate, and those of the presidents of the markets, were of the same double and confused nature. All of these functionaries belonged to the Eupatridæ, and all of them doubtless acted more or less in the narrow interest of their order: moreover there was ample room for favoritism, in the way of assistance, as well as malapolicy, on the part of the arbors. That such was decidedly the case, and that discontent began to be serious, we may infer from the duty imposed on the Chaldean King, 2-3 B.C., to put in writing the Thermal or Ordinances, so that they might be "shown publicly" and known beforehand. B.C. 2-3

He did not meddle with the political constitution, and in his ordinances-ordinances little worthy of remark except the extreme severity<sup>2</sup> of the punishments awarded: petty thefts, or even poverty (if none of life, being visited with death or dismemberment).

But we are not to construe this remark as denigrating any special infirmity in the character of Drake, who was not invested with the large power which Solita afterwards enjoyed, and cannot be imagined to have learned even the commonest

When Surpin 14-15, 112-113, is made in the exact proportion of 100/100, the word should be found in both the very purest, densest F. I doubt not and is added.

[illegible]

2. *ibid.* George Pollock 1991, 85. Quoted with permission. Taylor, Linda. *ibid.*, 85.

Respecting the charge of bias, our Editor at Milan, T. M. Hill, Jr. has published a column which explains the situation. It is his conviction that the American, in his attitude to the Jews, has been too lenient.



some loss of his own invention. Himself at times an Epurist, he set forth in writing such sentences as the Epurist archon had before him accustomed to deliver without writing, in the particular cases which came before them; and the general spirit of penal legislation had become so much milder, during the two centuries which followed, that these old sentences appeared to Aristotle ludicrously rigorous. Especially another Draco, not the Lokrian Zalmoxis, who somewhat preceded him in date, was more rigorous than the sentiment of the age: indeed the few fragments of the Draconian tables which have reached us, far from exhibiting indiscriminate cruelty, introduce, for the first time, into the Athenian law, mitigating distinctions in respect to homicide;<sup>1</sup> founded on the variety of concomitant circumstances. He is said to have constituted the judges called Ephectæ, fifty-one elders belonging to some respected gens or possessing an undisturbed position, who held their sittings for the trial of homicide in three different spots, according to the difference of the cases submitted to them. If the accused party, admitting the fact, denied any culpable intention and pleaded accident, the case was tried at the place called the Pellidæon; when found guilty of accidental homicide, he was condemned

pathos;  
homicide  
by homicide  
alone at  
Athens.

to a temporary exile, unless he could appease the relatives of the deceased, but his property was left untouched. If, again, admitting the fact, he defended himself by some valid ground of justification, such as self-defence, or flagrant robbery with his wife on the part of the deceased, the trial took place on ground consecrated to Apollo and Artemis, called the Desphæreion. A particular spot called the Pterostæon, close to the eastern wall, was named for the trial of a person, who, while under sentence of exile for an unintentional homicide, might be charged with a second homicide, committed of course without the limits of the territory: being considered as impure from the effects of the former sentence, he was not permitted to set foot on the soil, but stood his trial on a boat beached close to shore. At the Prytaneion or government-house itself, sittings were held by the four Ephe-

<sup>1</sup> Demosthenes, *de. leg.* § 2. According to the same author, the law of Draco was not so rigorous as it is represented, especially with respect to homicide. "The law of Draco," says Aristotle, "was not so severe as it is represented to be." See also Demosthenes, *de. leg.* § 2. See also Demosthenes, *de. leg.* § 2.









last shock from the hands of an ambitious Megastides who aspired to the dictatorship. Such was the phase (as has been remarked in the preceding chapter) through which, during the century now under consideration, a large proportion of the Grecian governments passed.

Kylon, an Athenian patrician—who aspired, to a great social position, the personal celebrity of a victory at Olympia, or runner in the double stadium—conceived <sup>Attempted</sup> the design of seizing the acropolis and constituting <sup>seizure by Kylon.</sup> himself despot. Whether any special event had occurred at home to stimulate this project, we do not know: but he obtained both encouragement and valuable aid from his father-in-law Theageneides of Megara, who, by means of his popularity with the people, had already subverted the Megarian oligarchy, and become despot of his native city. Previous to so hazardous an attempt, however, Kylon ascended the Delphian oracle, and was advised by the god in reply, to take the opportunity of "the greatest festival of Zeus" for seizing the acropolis. Such expressions, in the natural interpretation put upon them by every Greek, designated the Olympic games in Peloponnesus. To Kylon, moreover, himself an Olympic victor, that interpretation seems recommended by an apparent peculiar propriety. But Theophrastus, not indifferent to the credit of the oracle, recals to his readers that no question was asked nor any express direction given, where the intended "greatest festival of Zeus" was to be sought—whether in Attica or elsewhere—and that the public festival of the Eleusinia, celebrated periodically and solemnly in the neighbourhood of Athens, was also designated the "greatest festival of Zeus Metaktesus". Probably no such exegetical examples presented themselves to any one, until after the miserable failure of the conspiracy; least of all to Kylon himself, who, at the recurrence of the next ensuing Olympic games, put himself at the head of a force, partly furnished by Theageneides, partly composed of his friends at home, and took sudden possession of the sacred rock of Athens. But the attempt excited general indignation among the Athenian people, who crowded in from the country to assist the archons and the priests of the Mother in putting it down. Kylon and his companions were blockaded in the Acropolis, where they soon found themselves in straits for want of water and provisions; and

Though many of the Athenians went back to their homes, a sufficient bodygoing home was left to reduce the conspiracy to the last extremity. After Kylon himself had escaped by stealth, and several of his companions had died of hunger, the remainder, renouncing all hope of defence, sat down as suppliants at the altar. The archon Megakles, on regarding the cluster, forced these suppliants on the point of starving with hunger on the sacred ground, and to prevent such a pollution, engaged them to quit the spot by a promise of sparing their lives. No sooner however had they been removed into profane ground, than the promise was violated and they were put to death—some even, who, seeing the fate with which they were menaced, resorted to their own defence upon the altar of the Venerable goddesses (or Eumenides) near the Areopagus, reserved their death wounds in spite of that inviolable protection.<sup>1</sup>

Though the conspiracy was thus put down, and the government upheld, these deplorable incidents left behind them a long train of calamity—profound religious reverence mingled with unquenched political antipathies. There still remained, if not a considerable Kylonian party, at least a large body of persons who retained the way in which the Kylonians had been put to death, and who became in consequence bitter enemies of Megakles the archon, and of the great family of the Alkmeonidae, to which he belonged. Not only Megakles himself and his personal opponents were denounced as enemies with a curse, but the injury was supposed to be transmitted to his descendants, and we shall hereafter find the wound re-opened, not only in the second and third generation, but also two centuries after the original event.<sup>2</sup> When we see that the impression left by the preceding war so very serious, even after the length of time which had elapsed, we may well believe that a war without, immediately afterwards, to poison altogether the tranquillity of the state. The Alkmeonidae and their partisans long dated their opponents, entering any public trial. The discussions continued without hope of termination, until Solon, then enjoying a lofty reputation for sagacity and justice, as well as for bravery, persuaded them to submit to

<sup>1</sup> The narrative begins in Chapter I. Liddington, *Epoch* 486, and the 184, *Forest* 7, 11. *Plutarch*, *Solon*, 11. *Strabo*, *Geograph.* 7, 11.

hatched organisms,—at a moment so far distant from the onset of the miasm were dead. They were accordingly tried before a special jury of 200 Japanese, Myria of the name Phipps being their names. In defiance themselves against the charge,

the crew, tried and condemned of the Phipps.

that they had acted against the reverence due to the gods and the consecrated right of asylum, they alleged that the Eleans supplicated, when persuaded to quit the holy ground, had laid a cord round the statue of the goddess and clung to it for protection in their march; but on approaching the altar of the Demeterion, the cord suddenly broke—and this critical event (so the accused goddess argued) proved that the goddess had herself withdrawn from them her protecting hand and abandoned them to their fate.<sup>1</sup> Their argument, remarkable as an illustration of the feelings of the time, was not however accepted as an excuse. They were found guilty, and while such of them as were alive retired into banishment, those who had already died were disinterred and cast beyond the borders. Yet their exile, continuing as it did only for a time, was not held sufficient to expiate the impiety for which they had been condemned. The Alkmeonids, one of the most powerful families in Attica, long continued to be looked upon as a tainted race,<sup>2</sup> and in cases of public calamity were liable to be singled out as having by their conduct drawn down the judgment of the gods upon their countrymen.<sup>3</sup>

The banishment of the guilty parties was not found sufficient to restore tranquility. Not only did political disorders prevail, but the religious susceptibilities and apprehensions of the Athenian community also remained deplorably excited. They were increased with nervous and discomfited, new elements and

1. *Phonetic Spelling*, a H. H. Grayson of the University of the West had been given. *Phonetic Spelling* would have been added to explain my last name to the guests to avoid their being the first difference noted by the hostess.

When Cleveland was besieged by General Sherman, the islanders sought protection by fleeing to the mountains. In the mountains they married, and from the valleys the boys in the uniform of the militia, again were drafted and sent into the white South. The

Reading derived Polysyllabicity, whose first contribution to the English lexicon was the long-silencing of short vowels, was limited to what the initial of *Chaucer* by means of a vowel change. *ibid.*, 1999.

© 2000 Blackwell Science Ltd  
Journal of Internal Medicine 247: 395–402

1000

John David A. and his family  
are enjoying the summer in  
the mountains.



based supernatural resources, and felt the force of the gods upon  
 mortals <sup>them</sup> without statement.<sup>1</sup> In particular, it appears  
<sup>was</sup> that the manes of the women (whose religious opinions  
<sup>collecting</sup> were recognized generally by the ancient legislators as  
 requiring watchful control) were thus disturbed and frantic.  
 The sacrifices offered at Athens did not succeed in dispelling the  
 epidemic, nor could the prophets at home, though they recognized  
 that special purifications were required, discover what were the  
 new ceremonies capable of appeasing the divine wrath. The  
 Delphic oracle directed them to invite a higher spiritual  
 influence from abroad, and this produced the memorable visit of  
 the Kroton prophet and sage Epimenides to Athens.

The century between 600 and 500 B.C. appears to have been  
 remarkable for the first diffusion and potent influence of distinct  
 religious brotherhoods, mystic rites, and expiatory ceremonies,  
 some of which (as I have remarked in a former chapter) find any  
 recognition in the Homeric epic. To this age belong Thales,  
 Anaxora, Anaxila, Pythagoras, Orpheus, and the earliest  
 probable agency of the Orphic sect.<sup>2</sup> Of the class of  
 men here named, Epimenides, a native of Phlegon or  
 Knossos in Kreta,<sup>3</sup> was one of the most celebrated,—  
 and the old legendary connection between Athens and  
 Kreta, which shows itself in the tales of Theseus and  
 Minos, is here again manifested in the measures which  
 the Athenians had to take when to supply their spiritual need.  
 Epimenides seems to have been connected with the worship of the  
 Kroton Zeus, in whose favour he stood so high as to resolve the  
 demarcation of the new Kretian (the Kretian having been the  
 primitive religion and organization of that worship). He was said  
 to be the son of the nymph Dalis ; to be supplied by the nymphs  
 with constant food, since he was never seen to eat ; to have  
 fallen asleep in his youth in a cave, and to have awoken in this  
 state without interruption for fifty-seven years ; though some  
 asserted that he remained all this time a wanderer in the coun-  
 tryside, collecting and studying medicinal botany in the vicinity of

<sup>1</sup> Pindar, *Salvia*, v. 16. But other  
 only in the Homeric epic and the  
 earlier Greek epic.

<sup>2</sup> *Classical Dictionary*, s. v. 111 ;  
*Classical Dictionary*, s. v. 111.

<sup>3</sup> The statements respecting Epi-  
 menides are collected and arranged in  
 the *Classical Dictionary*, s. v. 111.

<sup>4</sup> *Classical Dictionary*, s. v. 111 ;  
*Classical Dictionary*, s. v. 111.



ritual precepts, from the type of a person supposed to stand high in the favour of Zeus, were the remedy which this unhappy disorder required. Moreover, Epimenides had the prudence to associate himself with Solon, and while he thus doubtless obtained much valuable advice, he assisted indirectly in creating the reputation of Solon himself, whose career of constitutional reform was now fast approaching. He remained long enough at Athens to restore completely a more comfortable tone of religious feeling, and then departed, carrying with him increased gratitude and admiration, but retaining all other reward, except a branch from the sacred olive tree in the acropolis.<sup>1</sup> His life is said to have been prolonged to the unusual period of 124 years, according to others, to a statement which was current during the time of his younger contemporary Xenophanes of Kolophon.<sup>2</sup> The Epicureans ventured to affirm that he lived 200 years. They styled him not merely as a sage and a spiritual pastor, but also as a poet—very long compositions on religious and mythical subjects being ascribed to him; according to some accounts, they even worshipped him as a god. Both Platon and Cicero considered Epimenides in the same light in which he was regarded by his contemporaries, as a prophet divinely inspired, and foretelling the future under the of temporary insanity. But according to Aristotle, Epimenides himself professed to have received from the gods no higher gift than that of divining the unknown phenomena of the past.<sup>3</sup>

The religious mission of Epimenides to Athens, and its influences as well as leading influences on the public mind, deserve notice as denunciations of the age in which they occurred.<sup>4</sup> If we transport ourselves two centuries forward to the Peloponnesian

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *Epimenides*. Plutarch, *Epimenides*, *Opusculi*, v. 17, p. 385.

<sup>2</sup> Xenophanes, *Colophon*, l. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, *Epimenides*, l. 1, p. 385; Cicero, *De Divinatione*, l. 1, c. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Plutarch, *Epimenides*, l. 1, p. 385; Cicero, *De Divinatione*, l. 1, c. 12.

whereas the real state is otherwise, the state is a mere shadow of the real, and is to be destroyed.

<sup>5</sup> According to the interpretation of this age, the real state is the shadow of the real, and is to be destroyed. The state is a mere shadow of the real, and is to be destroyed.

no such uncontrollable religious frenzy could well have seized the entire public; while, if it had, no living man could have drawn to himself such universal veneration as to be capable of effecting a cure. Plato, admitting the real healing influence of rites and ceremonies, fully believed in Epimenides as an inspired prophet during the pest; but towards those who preferred claims to supernatural power in his own day, he was not so easy of faith. He, as well as Euripides and Theophrastus, treated with indifference, and even with contempt, the Orphicists of the later times, who advertised themselves as possessing the same potent knowledge of secreted rites, and the same means of guiding the will of the gods, as Epimenides had wielded before them. These Orphicists unquestionably rendered a considerable tribe of believers, and operated with great effect, as well as with profit to themselves, upon the thinnest conscience of rich men.<sup>1</sup> But they stopped in respect with the general public, or with those to whose authority the public habitually looked up. Degenerate as they were, however, they were the legitimate representatives of the prophet and purifier from *Nemæa*, to whose process the Athenians had been so much indebted two centuries before; and their altered position was owing less to any falling off in themselves, than to an improvement in the mass upon whom they sought to operate. Had Epimenides himself come to Athens in those days, his visit would probably have been as much impopular to all public purposes as a repetition of the stratagem of Phryx, clothed and equipped as the golden Adonis, which had succeeded so completely in the days of Pelicleratus—a stratagem which even *Menodorus* treats as incredibly absurd, although a century before his time, both the city of Athens and the Deans of Attica had obeyed, as a divine mandate, the orders of this magnificent and stately woman to nurture Pelicleratus.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plato, *Republic*, p. 485; Plato p. 490, 491; Theophrast.

<sup>2</sup> *Eclog.* Hippolyt. 107; Plato, *Charmides*, p. 114.

<sup>3</sup> Menodot. l. 45.

## CHAPTER XL

## SOLONIAN LAWS AND CONSTITUTION.

We now approach a new era in Grecian history—the first known example of a peaceful and disinterested constitutional reform, and the first foundation-stone of that great fabric, which afterwards became the type of democracy in Greece. The archonship of the eugeneid Solon dates in B.C. 624, thirty years after that of Draco, and about eighteen years after the conspiracy of Kylon (according to the latter event to be correctly placed *B.C.* 642).

The lives of Solon, by Plutarch and Diogenes (especially the former) are our principal sources of information respecting this remarkable man, and while we thank them for what they have told us, it is impossible to avoid expressing disappointment that they have not told us more. For Plutarch certainly had before him both the original poems, and the original laws, of Solon, and the few manuscripts, which he gives from one or the other, form the principal charm of his biography. But such valuable materials ought to have been made available to a more instructive reader than that which he has brought out. There is hardly anything more to be deplored, amidst the lost treasures of the Grecian mind, than the poems of Solon; for we see by the remaining fragments, that they contained notions of the public and social phenomena before him, which he was compelled attentively to study—blended with the touching expression of his own personal feelings, in the part after honorable and difficult, in which the confidence of his countrymen had reposed on him.

Solon, son of Exekastides, was a Eugeneid of middling fortune,<sup>1</sup> but of the purest heroic blood, belonging to the gens or family of

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Solon, l. 1; Diogen. Laert. III. 1; Aelian. *Vita*. iv. 8, 10.

the Kolidae and Nisada, and tracing his origin to the god Poseidon. His father is said to have diminished his substance by prodigality, which compelled Solon in his earlier years to have recourse to trade, and in this pursuit he visited many parts of Greece and Asia. He was thus enabled to enlarge the sphere of his observation, and to provide material for thought as well as for composition. His poetical talents displayed themselves at a very early age, first on light, afterwards on serious subjects. It will be recalled that there was at that time no Greek prose writing, and that the acquisitions as well as the effusions of an uneducated man, even in their simplest form, adorned themselves not so the limitations of the period and the resources, but to the end of the hexameter and pentameter. Now in point of fact do the verses of Solon aspire to any higher effect than we are accustomed to associate with an earnest, teaching, and advisory prose composition. The advice and appeals which he frequently addressed to his countrymen<sup>1</sup> were delivered in this easy metre, doubtless far less difficult than the elaborate poems of subsequent writers or speakers, such as Theophrastus, Isokrates, or Demosthenes. His poetry and his reputation became known throughout many parts of Greece, so that he was chosen along with Thales of Miletus, Bias of Priene, Pittacus of Mytilene, and Pericles of Samos, Eleuthides of Lebes, Chelidon of Leontades—altogether forming the constellation afterwards renowned as the seven wise men.

<sup>1</sup> The first particular event in respect to which Solon appears as an active politician is the possession of the island of Salamis, then disputed between Megara and Athens. Megara was at that time able to contest with Athens, and for some time to contest with success, the occupation of the important island—a remarkable fact, which perhaps may be explained by supposing that the inhabitants of Athens and its neighbourhood carried on the struggle with only partial aid from the rest of Attica. However this may be, it appears that the Megarians had actually established themselves in Salamis, at the time when Solon began his political career, and that the Athenians had experienced as much loss in the struggle,

790  
Solon  
Athens  
Megara  
Salamis

<sup>1</sup> Pittacus, Solon, &c.

as to have formally prohibited any citizen from ever submitting a proposition for its rescission. Along with this dishonourable assignment, Solon counterfeited a state of extreme excitement, refused that the agora, and thereon the stone which occupied by the official herald, pronounced to the surrounding crowd a short elegiac poem<sup>1</sup> which he had previously composed on the subject of Salamis. Enforcing upon them the disgrace of shaming the island, he wrought so powerfully upon their feelings, that they rescinded the prohibitory law.—"Rather (he exclaimed) would I forsake my native city and become a citizen of Phidagathia, than be still named an Athenian, branded with the shame of surrendered Salamis!" The Athenians again entered into the war, and conferred upon him the command of it—partly, as we are told, at the instigation of Peisistratos, though the latter need have been at this time (680—674 B.C.) a very young man, or rather a boy.<sup>2</sup>

The stories in Pindar, as to the way in which Salamis was recovered, are contradictory as well as apocryphal, ascribing to Solon various stratagems to deceive the Megarian occupiers. Unfortunately no authority is given for any of them. According to that which seems the most plausible, he was directed by the Delphic god first to purify the local heroes of the island; and he accordingly arrived over as it by night, for the purpose of sacrificing to the heroes Periklydos and Kyprios on the Salaminian shore. Five hundred Athenian volunteers were then levied for the attack of the island, under the stipulation that if they were victorious they should hold in as property and citizenship.<sup>3</sup> They were sent,

<sup>1</sup> Pindar, Solon, vii. It was a poem of 160 lines, composed when victorious.

<sup>2</sup> Solon says as that "Solon read the verses to the people through the middle of the temple,"—a statement not less unlikely in itself than in accuracy, and which spoils the whole effect of the supposed stratagem, already cited before by Herodotus, l. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Pindar, l. vi. (Solon, l. vii) d. 20. Herodotus (l. vi) and some others read, by Pindar's stratagem Peisistratos having put in the war against the Megarians, and given the names of those the part of Megans. With the last exception of Peisistratos

was in 680 B.C., and we are hardly inclined that he can have been yet grown and recovered but was as less than forty years before.

It will be seen, however, from the note on the Delphic legend, that the war against Megara towards the end of the century that Herodotus, and perhaps other authors also, recorded. Peisistratos' legislation by that time would have been at least 40 years. Instead of the B.C. date placed, it cannot be the beginning of Peisistratos.

<sup>4</sup> Pindar, Solon, makes also not contradictory. The 1600 meeting of the Athenians at the beginning of the war, but it seems almost

landed on an outlying promontory, while Solon, having been fortunate enough to seize a ship which the Megarians had sent to watch the proceedings, mounted it with Athenians and sailed straight towards the city of Salamis, to which the Athenians who had landed also directed their march. The Megarians marched out from the city to repel the latter, and during the heat of the engagement, Solon, with his Megarian ship and Athenian crew, sailed directly to the city. The Megarians, interpreting this as the return of their own crew, permitted the ship to approach without resistance, and the city was then taken by surprise. Permission having been given to the Megarians to quit the island, Solon took possession of it for the Athenians, erecting a temple to Enyalios, the god of war, on Cape Eleutheron, near the city of Salamis.<sup>1</sup>

The citizens of Megara, however, made various efforts for the recovery of so valuable a possession, so that a war ensued long as well as disastrous to both parties. At last it was agreed between them to refer the dispute to the arbitration of Sparta, and two Spartans were appointed to decide it—Kritobolus, Anacampsis, Hypobolus, Anaxilas, and Kleonidas. The verdict <sup>in favour of Athens</sup> was founded on evidence which <sup>the</sup> Spartans <sup>devised by</sup> it was somewhat curious to trace. Both parties attempted <sup>to prove</sup> to show that the dead bodies buried in the island <sup>of Salamis</sup> <sup>in favour of</sup> <sup>Athena</sup> belonged to their own peculiar mode of interment, and both parties are said to have cited verses from the catalogue of the *Iliad*—each accusing the other of error or interpolation. But the Athenians had the advantage on two points: first there were oracles from Delphi, whereas Salamis was mentioned with the epithet *Ionian*; next Phallos and Eurychlos, some of the Salaminian Ajax, the great hero of the island, had accepted the citizenship of Athens, made over Salamis to the Athenians, and transferred their own residences to Eretria and Miletus in Asia,

probably justified that they would be disappointed in their efforts to prove themselves and, consequently, necessarily that on the pre-existing proposition would be reversed.

<sup>1</sup> Phylarch. *Solon*, §. 2, 12. The version of Phylarch, however, differs in Solon not having done so in the *Iliad* and *Phylarch*, comp. Solon and Phylarch. §. 2.

Polyperus §. 10. *Strabo* also differs in mentioning the *Iliad*. *Strabo* *Athen.* 9, 12, 16, 17. It is hardly necessary to say that the account which the Megarians give of the way in which they lost the island was hardly different; they claimed it as the territory of Eretria (see Phylarch. §. 2, 4).

<sup>2</sup> *Strabo* *Athen.* 9, 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Strabo*, *l. op.* 1, 16, 4.



where the deme or gens *Phalaina* still worshipped *Phalera* as its apocryphous ancestor. Such a tale was told collected, and Solon was obliged by the few Spartans to Athens,<sup>1</sup> with which it ever afterwards remained incorporated until the days of Macedonia's supremacy. Two centuries and a half later, when the orator *Androtus* argued the Athenian right to *Amphipolis* against *Philip* of Macedon, the legendary elements of the tale were indeed put forward, but more in the way of proof or introduction to the substantial political grounds.<sup>2</sup> But in the year 680 B.C., the authority of the legend was more despatched and operative, and adequate by itself to determine a favourable verdict.

In addition to the conquest of Salamis, Solon increased his reputation by exposing the case of the Delphic temple against the extortive proceedings of the inhabitants of *Corin*, of which more will be said in a coming chapter; and the fervour of the cause was probably not without its effect in procuring for him that encouraging prophesy with which his legislative career opened.

State of  
Athens  
before the  
legislation  
of Solon.

It is on the occasion of Solon's legislation that we obtain our first glimpse—unfortunately but a glimpse—of the actual state of Athens and its inhabitants. It is a sad and repulsive picture, presenting to us political discord and private suffering combined.

Fierce dissensions prevailed among the inhabitants of Athens, who were separated into three factions—the *Peblais*, or men of the plain, comprising *Athens*, *Eleusis*, and the neighbouring territory, among whom the greatest number of rich families were included; the mountaineers in the east and north of Athens, called *Digaiti*, who were on the whole the poorer party; and the *Paraiti* in the southern portion of Athens from sea to sea, whose means and social position were intermediate between the two.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Plutarch*, *Solon*, 18; compare *Androtus*, *Deleph.* c. 10. *Androtus* is said to be due to *Demetrius* (*Plutarch*, *Androtus*, c. 10). *Androtus* based up to the *Plutarch* (*Androtus*, c. 10).

<sup>2</sup> According to the tradition of Athens the *Androtus*, both the countrymen and the *Androtus* had the same way of language. Both referred the same way, both were from the same way. This statement however affects the

great of any possibility of Athenian history in 1810.

<sup>3</sup> The *Androtus*, or *Androtus*, is said to be the same *Androtus*, said to be the same of *Androtus* (*Androtus*, c. 10), which formed a portion of the city of Athens.

<sup>4</sup> *Androtus*, *Androtus*, c. 10, c. 10.

<sup>5</sup> *Androtus*, *Androtus*, c. 10. The two groups of *Androtus*, in which it is said of the *Androtus* as representing the

Upon what particular points these intestine disputes turned we are not distinctly informed. They were not however peculiar to the period immediately preceding the earthquake of Sicily. They had prevailed before, and they resuare afterwards prior to the depopulation of Polistrina; the latter standing forward as the leader of the Eubœi, and as champion, real or pretended, of the poorer population.

But in the time of Sicily these intestine quarrels were aggravated by something much more difficult to deal with—a general feeling of the poorer population against the rich, resulting from misery combined with oppression. The Thirce, whose condition we have already contemplated in the poems of Homer and Hesiod, are now presented to us as forming the bulk of the population of Attica—the cultivating tenants, metayers, and small proprietors of the country. They are exhibited as weighed down by debts and dependence, and driven in large numbers out of a state of freedom into slavery—the whole mass of them (we are told) being in debt to the rich, who were proprietors of the greater part of the soil. They had either borrowed money for their own necessities, or they tilled the lands of the rich as dependent tenants, paying a stipulated portion of the produce, and in this capacity they were largely in arrears.

All the mischievous effects were here seen of the old harsh law of debtor and creditor—once prevalent in Greece, Italy, Asia, and a large portion of the world—combined with the recognition

Journal  
Literature  
—History  
of the  
Greek  
Population.

of the old law of debtor and creditor, and the feeling of the poorer population against the rich, resulting from misery combined with oppression.

The Thirce, whose condition we have already contemplated in the poems of Homer and Hesiod, are now presented to us as forming the bulk of the population of Attica—the cultivating tenants, metayers, and small proprietors of the country. They are exhibited as weighed down by debts and dependence, and driven in large numbers out of a state of freedom into slavery—the whole mass of them (we are told) being in debt to the rich, who were proprietors of the greater part of the soil. They had either borrowed money for their own necessities, or they tilled the lands of the rich as dependent tenants, paying a stipulated portion of the produce, and in this capacity they were largely in arrears.

They were largely in arrears.

They were largely in arrears.

They were largely in arrears.



Solus Virgili, even in the short fragments preserved to us.<sup>1</sup> It appears that immediately preceding the time of his death, the evils had ripened to such a point—and the determination of the mass of sufferers, to seek for themselves some mode of relief, had become so pronounced—that the existing laws could no longer be enforced. According to the professed remark of Aristotle—that seditions are generated by great issues let out of small incidents<sup>2</sup>—we may conceive that some recent events had occurred as immediate stimulants to the outbreak of the debtors,—like those which lead to striking an interest in the early Roman wars, as the inflaming sparks of violent popular movements for which the time had long before been laid. Condemnations by the censors, of insolvent debtors, may have been unusually numerous; or the maltreatment of some particular debtor, once a respected freeman, in his condition of slavery, may have been brought to act vitally upon the public sympathies—like the case of the old plebeian censorial officer<sup>3</sup> first impoverished by the plunder of the enemy, then reduced to borrow, and lastly subjected to his creditor as an indentured, who kindled the passions of the people in the forum, routing their feelings to the highest pitch by the marks of the slave-whip visible on his person. Some such incidents had probably happened, though we have no historians to record them. Moreover it is not unreasonable to imagine, that that public mental affliction, which the purifier Epimenides

passed  
suffering and  
grievous  
for a long  
time.

<sup>1</sup> See the fragment and the *Alphabetic Catalogue*, No. 1, Introduction.

<sup>2</sup> See the fragment and the *Alphabetic Catalogue*, No. 1, Introduction.

<sup>3</sup> "What is the position of the public debt?" "The public debt is the debt of the state."

<sup>4</sup> "The public debt is the debt of the state."

<sup>5</sup> "The public debt is the debt of the state."

<sup>6</sup> "The public debt is the debt of the state."

<sup>7</sup> "The public debt is the debt of the state."

<sup>8</sup> "The public debt is the debt of the state."

<sup>9</sup> "The public debt is the debt of the state."

<sup>10</sup> As a general, however, the Romans were not so much interested in the public debt as the Greeks. The public debt was not a subject of public discussion, and the public debt was not a subject of public discussion.

The question of public debt, however, was not a subject of public discussion, and the public debt was not a subject of public discussion. The question of public debt, however, was not a subject of public discussion, and the public debt was not a subject of public discussion.

had been forced to appear, as it sprung in part from passion, as it had its cause partly in years of sterility, which must of course have aggravated the distress of the small cultivators. However this may be, such was the condition of things in 594 B.C., through misery of the poor freemen and Thetes, and exhaustion of the swelling aristocracy, that the governing oligarchy, unable either to relieve their private debts or to maintain their political power, were obliged to invoke the well-known wisdom and integrity of Solon. Though his vigorous protest (which decidedly rendered him acceptable to the mass of the people) against the iniquity of the existing system, had already been proclaimed in his poems—they still hoped that he would serve as an auxiliary to help them over their difficulties. They therefore chose him, nominally as arbiter along with Peisistrarchus, but with power to substitute legislation.

It had happened in several Greek states that the governing oligarchies, either by quarrels among their own members or by the general bad condition of the people under their government, were deprived of that hold upon the public mind which was essential to their power. Sometimes (as in the case of Pittacus of Mytilene anterior to the archonship of Solon, and often in the factions of the Italian republics in the middle ages)

the collision of opposing forces had rendered society untenable, and driven all parties to acquiesce in the choice of some reforming dictator. Usually, however, in the early Greek oligarchies, this ultimate crisis was anticipated by some ambitious individual, who availed himself of the public discontent to overthrow the oligarchy and usurp the powers of a despot. And so probably it might have happened in Athens, had not the recent failure of Kylon, with all its miserable consequences, operated

The outcome  
in early  
Greece  
despotism.

as a deterring motive. It is curious to read, in the words of Solon himself, the temper in which his appointment was conceived by a large portion of the community, but most especially by his own friends: hearing in mind that at this early day, so far as our knowledge goes, democratic government was a thing unknown in Greece—all Greek governments were either oligarchical or despotic, the mass of the freemen having not yet tasted of constitutional privileges. His

own friends and supporters were the last to forgive him, while redoubling the prevalent discontent, to multiply partners for himself personally, and even the supreme power. They even "killed him as a traitor, for declining to lead up the net when the fish were already snatched."<sup>1</sup> The sense of the people, in despair with their lot, would gladly have rewarded him in such an attempt; while many even among the oligarchy might have acquiesced in his personal government, from the mere apprehension of something worse if they resisted it. That Solon might easily have made himself despot instead of better doctor. And though the position of a Greek despot was always perilous, he would, best of all, have greater facility for maintaining himself in it than Pericles possessed after him; so that nothing but the combination of probeness and virtue, which marks his lofty character, restricted him within the trust specially confided to him. To the surprise of every man,—to the dissatisfaction of his own friends,—under the complaints (as he says) of various extreme and discontented parties, who required him to adopt measures fatal to the peace of society,<sup>2</sup>—he set himself honestly to solve the very difficult and critical problem submitted to him.

Of all grievances the most urgent was the condition of the poorer class of debtors. To their relief Robert's first measure, the memorable Statute in 1352, or shaking off of burthens, was directed. The relief which it afforded was complete and immediate. It cancelled at once all those contracts in which the debtor had borrowed on the security either of his person or of his land: it forbade all future loans or contracts in which the person of the debtor was pledged as security: it deprived the creditor in future of all power to imprison, or sell, or attach work from, his debtor, and confined him to an effective judgment at law authorising the seizure of the property of the latter. It went off at

What Statute, or Statutes, are referred to in the paper on the poor debtors.

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

1. See *Flanagan, Collins*, 147, and also, with due disclaimer, *International and Global Studies*, 1, 1992, 10-11, 12-13, 14-15.

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 105–112

2000 2001 2002 2003 2004

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

1000

### Abstract

[illegible][illegible]

**WILEY**

**Abstract**







is it confirmed by any passage now remaining of the Solonian poems.<sup>1</sup> Plutarch conceives the poor debtors as having in their minds the comparison with Lykurgos and the equality of property at Sparta, which (as I have already endeavored to show)<sup>2</sup> is a fiction; and even had it been true as matter of history long past and antiquated, would not have been likely to work upon the minds of the multitude of Attica in the facile way that the biographer supposes. The *Seimotheken* must have expended the feelings and diminished the fortunes of many persons, but it gave to the large body of Thetes and small proprietors all that they could possibly have hoped. We are told that after a short interval it became universally acceptable in the general public mind, and procured for Solon a great increase of popularity—all results concerning in a common sacrifice of thanksgiving and harmony.<sup>3</sup> One incident there was which occasioned an outcry of indignation. Three rich friends of Solon, all men of great family in the state, and bearing names which will hereafter recur in this history as borne by their descendants—Kleitos, Kleinos, and Hippokratēs—having obtained from Solon some previous hint of his designs, plotted by it, first, to borrow money, and next, to make purchases of lands; and this selfish breach of confidence would have disgraced Solon himself, had it not been found that he was personally a great loser, having lent money to the extent of five talents.<sup>4</sup>

In regard to the whole measure of the *Seimothekia*, indeed, though the poems of Solon were open to every one, ancient authors gave different statements both of its purport and of its extent. Most of them construed it as having cancelled indiscriminately all money contracts; while Androtimos and others thought that it did nothing more than lower the rate of interest and depreciate the currency to the extent of 37 per cent, leaving the letter of the contracts unchanged. How Androtimos came to maintain such an opinion, we cannot easily understand. For the fragments now remaining from Solon seem distinctly to refute it,

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Solon, c. 18.

<sup>2</sup> See above, part II. ch. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, l. c. *Seimothekia* and *Seimothekion* appear in the Greek manuscripts, etc.

<sup>4</sup> The *Seimothekia* is noticed, but without specification of the names of the friends, in Plutarch, *Agath. Anaxag.* *Plutarch*, p. 371.

through, on the other hand, they do not go so far as to substantiate the full extent of the opposite view maintained by many writers. —That all money contracts indiscriminately were rescinded,<sup>1</sup> against which there is also a further reason, that if the fact had been so, Solon would have had no motive to define the money-standard. Each delinquent supposes that there must have been some debtors at least whose contracts remained valid, and whose worthiness he desired partially to attest. His poems distinctly mention three things:—1. The removal of the mortgage-pillars. 2. The enfranchisement of the land. 3. The protection, liberation, and restoration of the persons of endangered or enslaved debtors. All these expressions point distinctly to the Thetes and small proprietors, whose sufferings and peril were the most urgent, and whose case required a remedy immediate as well as complete. We find that his repudiation of debts was carried far enough to concern to them, but no farther.

It seems to have been the respect entertained for the character of Solon which partly occasioned these various measures. His misapprehensions of his obligations for the relief of debtors. Aristotile in ancient, and some eminent critics in modern times, are anxious to make out that he gave relief without loss or injustice to any one. But this opinion seems inadmissible. The law to creditors by the wholesale abrogation of numerous pre-existing contracts, and by the partial depreciation of the coin, is a fact not

<sup>1</sup> Pottsch, *Solon*, p. 11. The state, next to Aristotle, of Solon, is ascribed to the bearing of the Declaration in its full and unqualifiedly liberating significance with a view to the debtors who were liable to the seizure of their bodies and their lands, and who were really poor—not to all debtors.

Bruckhahn, *Proleg. (Solon)*, p. 11 and the *Declaration* (No. 100), p. 100, express themselves differently.

Bruckhahn's *Decl. (Solon)*, p. 11, p. 100 and F. F. Schlegel, *Op. Schlegel*, p. 100 quote the *Declaration* and the emergency protest against oppression, as evidence of the bearing of the *Declaration* on the Thetes and small land-owners only in a false position; I protest by pointing to the fact of any manner applicable to the time

of Solon; the mere mention of the words of Five Hundred in 15, shows that it belongs to those subsequent to the *Declaration* mentioned. See also the passage from Pottsch (No. 100) in the text.

Bruckhahn and Schlegel appear to me to require too much the effect of Solon's measure to reference to the *Declaration* of Solon. But in the other hand, they judge the effect of the measure to be such as to without any published evidence that Solon had in mind to give relief to the poor proprietors. Of this I am so good and Bruckhahn is so sure. A large proportion of the small debtors of the time, concerned were probably free proprietors before. The evidence of the fact, or to suppose pillars upon their land proper side.

to be dispensed. The *Seimothitade* of Solon, subject as far as it remained private agreements, but highly salutary in its consequences, is to be vindicated by showing that in no other way could the bonds of government have been held together, or the misery of the multitude alleviated. We are to consider, first, the great personal cruelty of these pre-existing contracts, which condemned the body of the free debtor and his family to slavery; next, the profound detestation excited by such a system in the large mass of the poor, against both the judges and the creditors by whom it had been enforced, which rendered their feelings unmanageable, as soon as they came together under the sanction of a common danger and with the determination to secure to each other mutual protection. Moreover, the law which vests a creditor with power over the person of his debtor, as as to convert him into a slave, is likely to give rise to a class of loans which inspire nothing but abhorrence—money lent with the foreknowledge that the borrower will be unable to repay it, but also in the conviction that the value of his person as a slave will make good the loan; thus reducing him to a condition of extreme misery, for the purpose sometimes of appeasement, sometimes of enriching, the lender. Now the foundation on which the respect for contracts rests, under a good law of debtor and creditor, is the very reverse of this. It rests on the firm conviction that such contracts are advantageous to both parties as a class, and that to break up the confidence essential to their existence would produce enormous mischief throughout all society. The man whose reverence for the obligation of a contract is now the most profound, would have entertained a very different sentiment if he had witnessed the dealings of lender and borrower at Athens under the old anti-Solonian law. The oligarchy had tried their best to enforce this law of debtor and creditor with its draconian series of contracts; and the only reason why they consented to invite the aid of Solon was because they had lost the power of enforcing it any longer, in consequence of the newly awakened courage and indignation of the people. That which they could not do for themselves, Solon could not have done for them, even had he been willing. Nor had he in his position the means either of exempting or expunging those creditors who, separately taken, were open to no reproach; indeed, in following his proceedings,

we have plainly that he thought compensation due, not to the creditors, but to the past sufferers of the enslaved debtors, since he released several of them from foreign captivity, and brought them back to their home. It is certain that no resources, simply and exclusively prospective, would have sufficed for the emergency. There was an absolute necessity for overruling all that class of pre-existing rights which had produced so violent a social fever. While, therefore, to this extent, the French debt cannot be regarded as unjust, we may confidently affirm that the expense incurred was an indispensable price paid for the maintenance of the peace of society, and for the final abrogation of a disastrous system as regarded individuals.<sup>1</sup> And the feeling as well as the legislation universal in the modern European world, by insinuating behind all contracts for selling a man's person or that of his children into slavery, goes far to sanction practically the Solomonian reputation.

One thing is never to be forgotten in regard to this measure, combined with the concurrent amendments introduced by Solon to the law—it settled finally the question to which it referred. Never again do we hear of the law of debtor and creditor as disturbing Athenian tranquillity. The general sentiment which grew up at Athens, under the Solonian money-law and under the democratic government, was one of high respect for the sanctity of contracts. Not only was there never any demand for the abolition of the money-lender, but a depreciation of the money-standard, but a formal abrogation of any such projects was inserted in the solemn oath taken annually by the numerous *Dikasts*, who formed the popular judicial body called *Helia* or the *Heliastic Jurors*.

But we have hardly settled the question—do you suppose that the Athenians would have been so ready to respect the sanctity of contracts as to have inserted in their annual oath a formal abrogation of any such projects?

<sup>1</sup> That which Solon did for the Athenian people in regard to debt is less than what was promised to the Roman people at the time of its liberation by the *Lex Licinia Mucia* in 367 B.C. by *Memmius* Agrippa, the enemy of the senate. In liberating them, though it does not seem to have been well received (Pliny, *Nat. H. H.*), he gave up the abrogation of all the debts which would be pay, without compensation of the *Lex Licinia Mucia* or its equivalent, which protected the senate.

Dr. Todd justly observes respecting Solon, "He must be considered as an arbitrator in whom all the parties interested submitted their claims, with the general understanding that they should be decided by him, not upon the footing of legal right, but according to the interests of the public interest. It was in this light that he himself regarded his office, and he appears to have discharged it nobly and disinterestedly." (*History of Greece*, vol. II. ch. v. p. 47.)





state of feeling, a loan on interest presents the repulsive idea of making profit out of the distress of the borrower. Moreover, it is worthy of remark, that the first borrower must have been for the most part men driven to this necessity by the pressure of want, and contracting debt as a desperate resource, without any fair prospect of being able to repay: debt and luxury run together in the mind of the poor Rouman.<sup>1</sup> The borrower is, in this unhappy state, rather a distressed man soliciting aid, than a solvent man, capable of making and fulfilling a contract. If he cannot find a friend to make him a free gift in the former character, he will not, under the latter character, obtain a loan from a stranger, except by the promise of exorbitant interest,<sup>2</sup> and by the follow-

ment." C. II. "Statutul generalizat, dar, tot din neputinta, din necesitate obligatoriu."

<sup>1</sup> *Statut, Cyp. 23, 47, 64.* "Bucuresti se caracterizeaza, din toate punctele de vedere, prin faptul ca este un oraș în care se găsește în cea mai mare parte a populației, în special în cea mai săracă, o masă de oameni care trăiesc în cea mai deplină nevoie și care sunt forțați să se îndrepte spre împrumuturi ca singura sursă de existență."

<sup>2</sup> "La toate cele arătate anterior, trebuie adăugate și următoarele: în orașele care sunt în nevoie, în special în cele care sunt în cea mai mare nevoie, se găsește în cea mai mare parte a populației, în special în cea mai săracă, o masă de oameni care trăiesc în cea mai deplină nevoie și care sunt forțați să se îndrepte spre împrumuturi ca singura sursă de existență."

... "La toate cele arătate anterior, trebuie adăugate și următoarele: în orașele care sunt în nevoie, în special în cele care sunt în cea mai mare nevoie, se găsește în cea mai mare parte a populației, în special în cea mai săracă, o masă de oameni care trăiesc în cea mai deplină nevoie și care sunt forțați să se îndrepte spre împrumuturi ca singura sursă de existență."

... "La toate cele arătate anterior, trebuie adăugate și următoarele: în orașele care sunt în nevoie, în special în cele care sunt în cea mai mare nevoie, se găsește în cea mai mare parte a populației, în special în cea mai săracă, o masă de oameni care trăiesc în cea mai deplină nevoie și care sunt forțați să se îndrepte spre împrumuturi ca singura sursă de existență."

... "La toate cele arătate anterior, trebuie adăugate și următoarele: în orașele care sunt în nevoie, în special în cele care sunt în cea mai mare nevoie, se găsește în cea mai mare parte a populației, în special în cea mai săracă, o masă de oameni care trăiesc în cea mai deplină nevoie și care sunt forțați să se îndrepte spre împrumuturi ca singura sursă de existență."

... "La toate cele arătate anterior, trebuie adăugate și următoarele: în orașele care sunt în nevoie, în special în cele care sunt în cea mai mare nevoie, se găsește în cea mai mare parte a populației, în special în cea mai săracă, o masă de oameni care trăiesc în cea mai deplină nevoie și care sunt forțați să se îndrepte spre împrumuturi ca singura sursă de existență."

... "La toate cele arătate anterior, trebuie adăugate și următoarele: în orașele care sunt în nevoie, în special în cele care sunt în cea mai mare nevoie, se găsește în cea mai mare parte a populației, în special în cea mai săracă, o masă de oameni care trăiesc în cea mai deplină nevoie și care sunt forțați să se îndrepte spre împrumuturi ca singura sursă de existență."

... "La toate cele arătate anterior, trebuie adăugate și următoarele: în orașele care sunt în nevoie, în special în cele care sunt în cea mai mare nevoie, se găsește în cea mai mare parte a populației, în special în cea mai săracă, o masă de oameni care trăiesc în cea mai deplină nevoie și care sunt forțați să se îndrepte spre împrumuturi ca singura sursă de existență."

... "La toate cele arătate anterior, trebuie adăugate și următoarele: în orașele care sunt în nevoie, în special în cele care sunt în cea mai mare nevoie, se găsește în cea mai mare parte a populației, în special în cea mai săracă, o masă de oameni care trăiesc în cea mai deplină nevoie și care sunt forțați să se îndrepte spre împrumuturi ca singura sursă de existență."

original power over his person, which he is in a condition to grant. In process of time a new class of borrowers rises up who demand money for temporary convenience or profit, but with full prospect of repayment—a relation of lender and borrower quite different from that of the earlier period, when it presented itself in the repulsive form of usury on the one side, not against the prospect of very large profit on the other. If the Germans of the time of Tacitus looked to the condition of the poor debtor in Gaul, related to servitude under a rich creditor, and swelling by hundreds the crowd of his attendants, they would not be disposed to regret their own ignorance of the practice of money-lending!

It proves that at the close of the eighteenth century, in Germany, it is not possible for a man, when he is related to his family, to be able to do so. The state is a source of the knowledge, providing, providing what must be done with a man of money, given to the state for the purpose of the state—providing that money under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so. The state, under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so. The state, under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so.

The German, however, in the year 1800, in which the state is the source of the knowledge, providing, providing what must be done with a man of money, given to the state for the purpose of the state—providing that money under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so. The state, under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so.

The state, however, in the year 1800, in which the state is the source of the knowledge, providing, providing what must be done with a man of money, given to the state for the purpose of the state—providing that money under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so. The state, under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so.

in money." The writer, however, in the year 1800, in which the state is the source of the knowledge, providing, providing what must be done with a man of money, given to the state for the purpose of the state—providing that money under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so.

According to the Treaty of the year 1800, in which the state is the source of the knowledge, providing, providing what must be done with a man of money, given to the state for the purpose of the state—providing that money under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so.

A striking witness of the state, however, in the year 1800, in which the state is the source of the knowledge, providing, providing what must be done with a man of money, given to the state for the purpose of the state—providing that money under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so.

The state, however, in the year 1800, in which the state is the source of the knowledge, providing, providing what must be done with a man of money, given to the state for the purpose of the state—providing that money under the name of carrying out of property and interests, and directing them to the state, and that it is not possible to do so.



How much the interest of money was then regarded as an undue profit extorted from distress, is powerfully illustrated by the old Jewish law; the Jew being permitted to take interest from foreigners (whom the lawgiver did not think himself obliged to protect), but not from his own countrymen.<sup>1</sup> The Koran follows out this point of view consistently, and prohibits the taking of interest altogether. In most other nations, laws have been made to limit the rate of interest, and at Rome especially, the legal rate was successively lowered—though it seems, as might have been expected, that the restrictive ordinances were constantly eluded. All such restrictions have been intended for the protection of debtors; an effect which large experience proves them never to

with the holding of their persons in captivity. *Commentary* (Pittsburgh, Pa. October 1870), vol. 1, p. 186.

<sup>1</sup> *Laws*, vol. II—67. *Deuteron*, chap. 23. This statement agrees with nearly all traditions; yet M. Salver (Glossaire des Institutions de Moïse, p. 114) is of opinion (based much in weight) that the original commandment referred to was: "Thou thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury, but unto a stranger thou shalt lend upon usury." It is of more importance to remark that this word here translated usury really means any interest for money, grain or stock—in the opinion of the translators of several Jewish writers, appended at Paris in 1807, cited in M. Salver's work, &c.

The Koran here declares its law between Jew and Jew, as well as between Jew and the infidel Mohammedan, notwithstanding that the Jews were as far as the Koran is prohibiting all taking of interest. That its enactments were not upon a pretext, we have no need to look to the proceedings of a Council at the building of the sacred temple—which presents in nature a parallel to early records in the Holy Scriptures, and the Koran, the latter of it is true, *Pittsburgh*, Constitution of Israel and Palestine, vol. I, p. 186.

<sup>2</sup> The Koran states, the people undertook to the carrying on of this work, and the prominent theory which they were allowed to exchange for being it as speedily a construction, being very great . . . there was taken to relieve them from a much greater burden, the oppression of usury, which they have in great misery by usury, and that

much greater must be complete of. For the rate, making reference to the condition of the nation that had acquired happiness of them, making them pay the mortgage for all debts less than, that is, 1 per cent, for every month, which amounted to 12 per cent, for the whole year, so that they were bound to pay twice their loans, subject their children also severely, to have whatever is they found for the support of themselves and their families, which being a merciless burden of the law of God, given them by Moses (the Koran holds all the rest of Israel to have many of any of their traditions, including, as the Koran itself, interest forbidden, in terms as great as liberty). It is clear that the Koran is a general summary of all the laws, which having not been upon them the words of the officers, have given a branch of law of the Koran law, and have many an expression upon their traditions, and how much it might provide the words of God and the Koran, he would be to be assisted by the general understanding of the Koran. That it might present to their traditions whatever had been accepted of them upon usury, and also upon all the laws, traditions, ordinances, and laws, which had been taken of them upon usury, and the Koran law.

The manner of Palestine appears that to have been not nearly a Mohammedan work as that of Israel, but also a Mohammedan or religious of interest paid by the debtor in Palestine, in addition to the proceeds of the Mortgage on any property belonging from their property, as recorded above, Chapter II.

perhaps, unless it be called protective to render the obtaining of money on loan unprofitable for the most chartered borrowers. But there was another effect which they did tend to produce—they softened down the penitence antipathy against the practice generally, and withdrew the active sense of wrong to loans lent above the fixed legal rate.

In this way alone could they operate beneficially, and their tendency to counterwork the previous feeling was at that time not unimportant, amounting as it did with other tendencies arising out of the industrial progress of society, which gradually exhibited the relation of lender and borrower in a light more comparatively beneficial, and less repugnant to the sympathies of the bystander.<sup>1</sup>

At Athens the more favourable point of view prevailed throughout all the historical times. The march of industry and commerce, under the unimpeded law which prevailed subsequently to Solon, had been sufficient to bring it about at a very early period and to suppress all public antipathy against loans at interest.<sup>2</sup> We may remark too that this more equitable tone of opinion grew up spontaneously, without any legal restriction on the rate of interest,—no such restriction having ever been imposed and the rate being expressly declared free by a law ascribed to Solon himself.<sup>3</sup> The same may probably be said of the communities of Greece generally—at least there is no indication to make us suppose the contrary. But the feeling against lending money at interest resulted in the bosoms of the philosophical men long after it had ceased to form a part of the practical morality of the citizens, and long after it had ceased to be justified by the appearance of

This opinion was shared by the philosophers, who in fact ceased to prevail in the community generally.

<sup>1</sup> In every law to limit the rate of interest, it is at once implied that the law has only sought to fix, and can do so, the maximum rate at which money is to be lent. The influence of those influences and the sympathy with public necessities, this would not be the case for the regulation of the rate of interest, even if though they make it almost to take any interest at all. (See, however, *Deconomics* which, in the case of the law, is intended to be a law of interest.) (See *Deconomics* which, in the case of the law, is intended to be a law of interest.)

law, though passed, was not carried into execution.

<sup>2</sup> Aristotle (*Politics*, Book, of Athens, B. I. ch. vi. p. 129) takes differently—in my judgment, contrary to the evidence—the passages in which he states positively that the Athenians were not contented to receive interest, and there are other passages which go far to contradict it.

<sup>3</sup> *Politics* and *Thomson*, A. & B. 1. 1.

the case as at first it really had been. Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Plutarch treat the practice as a branch of that unwarlike and money-getting spirit which they are uniformly denouncing; and one consequence of this was, that they were less disposed to contend strenuously for the invalidity of creating money contracts. The conservative feeling on this point was stronger among the poets than among the philosophers. Plato even complains of it as 'universally predominant,' and as arresting the legislator in all comprehensive projects of reform. For the most part indeed schemes of cancelling debts and relieving lands were never thought of except by men of desperate and selfish ambition, who made them stepping-stones to despotic power. Such men were denounced alike by the practical sense of the community and by the speculative thinkers: but when we turn to the case of the Spartan king Ages III., who proposed a complete extinction of debts and an equal redistribution of the landed property of the state, not with any selfish or personal views, but upon pure ideas of patriotism, well or ill understood, and for the purpose of renovating the lost ascendancy of Sparta—we find Plutarch expressing the most unqualified admiration of this young king and his projects, and treating the opposition made to him as originating in no better feelings than meanness and envy. The philosophical thinkers on politics conceived (and to a great degree justly, as I shall show hereafter) that the conditions of society, in the ancient world, imposed upon the citizens generally the absolute necessity of keeping up a military spirit and willingness to bear at all times personal hardship and discomfort: so that increases of wealth, on account of the habits of self-indulgence

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

[illegible]

George says there are good principles about the matter of funding fields by students, but the universities in this effort seem to be oversteering with an inappropriate reaction. He believes it to be true that both

shall not be considered to be subject  
herein to the said "Quarantine  
and Isolation" regulations, and  
all my officers, crew, passengers, and  
particulars, the goods and merchandise  
on board, shall, and, if legal, up to  
thirty days, proceed, without trans-  
fer of officers, etc. From the place  
where we are, which I have had in the  
mind, to the harbor. Complete the  
said subject, please. (2000, 1, 10, 10)

<sup>1</sup> See Fisiak's list of *AgP* examples. I should like to mention in this context the analysis of language levels of the speakers from all three, in the spirit of Lyons, compared to the meaning levels of the text (Gibson, 1984, p. 4).

which is commonly introduced, was regarded by them with more or less of disfavour. If in their estimation any Greek community had become corrupt, they were willing to restore great interference with pre-existing rights for the purpose of bringing it back nearer to their ideal standard. And the real security for the maintenance of these rights lay in the conservative feelings of the citizens generally, much more than in the opinions which superior minds imbibed from the philosophers.

Such conservative feelings were in the subsequent Athenian democracy peculiarly deep-rooted. The ruin of the Athenian people identified inseparably the maintenance of property in all its various shapes with that of their laws and constitution. And it is a remarkable fact, that though the alteration entertained at Athens for Solon was universal, the principle of his Solonism and of his money-depreciation was not only never insisted, but found the strongest test-approbation; whereas at Rome, as well as in most of the kingdoms of modern Europe, we know that one debasement of the coin succeeded another. The temptations, of thus partially slaking the thirst for financial embellishments, proved, after one successful trial, too strong to be resisted, and brought down the coin by successive depreciations from the full pound of twelve ounces to the standard of one half ounce. It is of some importance to take notice of this fact, when we reflect how much "Grecian faith" has been degraded by the Roman writers into a byword for duplicity in pecuniary dealings.<sup>1</sup> The democracy of Athens (and indeed the cities of Greece generally, both oligarchies and democracies) stands far above the senate of Rome, and far above the

Solonian  
Solonism  
then never  
insisted at  
Athens—  
except  
occasionally  
to remedy  
imprudent  
alterations.

<sup>1</sup> "Great his marvel," Polybius says, the Greeks greatly envy the Romans in point of temper and good faith, (p. 147), in another passage he speaks not only of confidence, (p. 151), but the testimony of the Senate is given as evidence in the case of Alcibiades, (p. 152), and again p. 157 an expression is used to allude almost to the same. In Roman times, says Polybius, (p. 158), the Senate was pronounced to be the best of all governments. (Polybius, *Pol. Hist.* i. 62.)

The character of Solonian Athenianism (archaism), p. 209, especially, depends very considerably on the sense of good faith and credit in Athens.

The whole form and aspect of the Republic of Sparta, which is almost entirely in a remarkable degree, at the request of the Athenian Embassy, for stated Solonism, were similar. But nothing more than that of pecuniary matters is mentioned, and the great sources of Solonism, and, first and foremost, the character of the constitution of good government, (p. 158), were, according to Polybius, (p. 158), the source of the Republic of a democratic form, (Polybius, *Pol. Hist.* i. 62, p. 158, 159.)













on duties on imports, fell upon them in common with the rest; and the great result was, that these latter were, throughout a long period of Athenian history, in steady operation, while the direct taxes were only levied on rare occasions.

But though this fourth class, constituting the great numerical majority of the free people, were shut out from individual office, their collective importance was in another way greatly increased. They were invested with the right of choosing the annual archons, out of the class of *Proklesisqualified*; and what was of more importance still, the archons and the magistrates generally, after their year of office, instead of being accountable to the senate of *Areopagus*, were made formally accountable to the public assembly during its judgment upon their past conduct. They might be impeached and called upon to defend themselves, punished in case of misbehaviour, and deprived from the usual honour of a seat in the senate of *Areopagus*.

Had the public assembly been called upon to act alone without aid or guidance, this accountability would have proved only nominal. But Solon converted it into a reality by creating a new institution, which will hereafter be found of great moment in the working out of the Athenian democracy. He created the *proklesis*, or pre-considering senate, with intimate and especial reference to the public assembly—to prepare matters for its discussion, to converse and experiment in meetings, and to secure the execution of its decrees. The senate, as first constituted by Solon, comprised 400 members, taken in equal proportions from the four tribes,—not chosen by lot (as they will be found to be in the more advanced stage of the democracy), but elected by the people, in the same way as the archons then were,—persons of the fourth or poorest class of the census, though contributing to elect, and being themselves eligible.

But while Solon thus created the new pre-considering senate, clothed with real authority to the popular assembly, he manifested no jealousy of the pre-existing *Areopagitic* senate of *Areopagus*. On the contrary, he enlarged its powers, gave to that simple organization, over the execution of

Further  
power  
than  
archons  
possessed  
only in  
nominal  
capacity—  
about the  
proceedings  
and laws  
of the  
assembly.

Further  
power  
than  
archons  
possessed  
before of  
power  
limited.

Senate of  
*Areopagus*.  
—the pre-  
existing  
senate.





elaboration of the democratic mind of Athens—gradually prepared, doubtless, during the interval between Kleisthenes and Pericles, but not brought into full operation until the period of the latter (460—430 B.C.). For it is hardly possible to conceive these numerous *ekklesiæ* and assemblies in regular, frequent, and long standing operation, without an assured payment to the citizens who composed them. Now such payment first began to be made about the time of Pericles, if not by his actual proposition;<sup>1</sup> and Demosthenes had good reason for contending that if it were suspended, the political as well as the administrative system of Athens would at once fall to pieces.<sup>2</sup> It would be a marvel, such as nothing short of strong direct evidence would justify us in believing, that in an age when even partial democracy was yet untried, Solon should conceive the idea of such institutions; it would be a marvel still greater that

Solon  
saw how  
necessary  
the law  
should be  
made  
at the  
very laws.

the half-civilized Thetes and small proprietors, for whom he legislated—yet dwelling under the rod of the Expatriated archons, and utterly inexperienced in collective business—should have been found suddenly competent to fulfil these arduous functions, such as

the citizens of comparing Athens in the days of Pericles—full of the assumption of force and actively identifying themselves with the dignity of their community—became gradually competent, and not more than competent, to exercise with effect. To suppose that Solon contemplated and provided for the periodical revision of his laws by establishing a Nomoethic jury or assembly, such as that which waited in operation during the time of Demosthenes, would be at variance (in my judgment) with any reasonable estimate either of the man or of the age. Herodotus says that Solon, having enacted from the Athenians solemn oaths that they would not rescind any of his laws for ten years, quitted Athens for that period, in order that he might not be compelled to rescind them himself. Plutarch informs us that he gave in his laws force for a century absolute.<sup>3</sup> Solon himself, and Dikea before him, had been largely evaded and empowered by the special emer-

<sup>1</sup> See Smith, *Public Economy of Athens*, Book II. c. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Demosthenes, *cont.*, translat. c. 10, p. 111. compare *Antiphonæ*, *ekklesiastikon*, 209.

<sup>3</sup> Herodot. i. 61; Plutarch, *Solon*, c. 10. Andon Solon asserts that the Athenians were called, giving religious sanction to observe them for ever &c. &c.

prize of the times: the idea of a frequent revision of laws, by a body of selected citizens, belongs to a far more advanced age, and could not well have been present to the minds of either. The wooden tablet of Solon, like the tablet of the Roman decemviri, was doubtless intended as a permanent "font manna politica juris".

If we examine the facts of the case, we shall see that nothing more than the bare foundation of the democracy of Athens as it stood in the time of Pericles, can reasonably be ascribed to Solon. "I gave to the people (Solon says in one of his short remaining fragments) as much strength as sufficed for their needs, without either enlarging or diminishing their dignity: for those too who possessed power and were noted for wealth, I took care that no unworthy treatment should be reserved. I stood with the strong shield cast over both parties, so as not to allow an unjust triumph to either." Again, Aristotle tells us that Solon bestowed upon the people as much power as was indispensable, but no more: "the power to elect their magistrates and hold them to accountability: if the people had had less than this, they could not have been expected to remain tranquil—they

being told  
that from  
the Athen-  
ians they  
were, and  
the Solon  
that was  
not prop-  
erly stated.

1. *Clay, Cl. 22.*

2. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

3. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

4. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

5. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

6. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

7. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

8. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

9. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

10. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

11. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

12. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

13. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

14. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

15. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

16. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

17. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

18. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

19. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

20. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

21. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

22. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

23. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

24. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

25. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

26. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

27. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

28. *Clay, Cl. 22, at 11 lines.*

would have been in slavery and hostile to the constitution. Not less distinctly does Herodotus speak, when he describes the revolution subsequently operated by Kleisthenes—the latter (as tells us) forced “the Athenian people excluded from everything.” These passages seem positively to contradict the supposition, in itself sufficiently improbable, that Solon is the author of the peculiar democratical institutions of Athens, such as the constant and numerous tribuna for judicial trials and reviews of laws. The genuine and forward democratical movement of Athens began only with Kleisthenes, from the moment when that distinguished Athenian, either spontaneously or from feeling himself treated in his party strife with injustice, purchased by large popular concessions the hearty co-operation of the multitude under very desperate circumstances. While Solon, in his own statement as well as in that of Aristotle, gave to the people as much power as was strictly needed, but no more—Kleisthenes (to use the significant phrases of Herodotus), “being vanquished in the party contest with his rival, took the people into partnership.” It was, then, in the interests of the weaker motion, in a strife of contending motions, that the Athenian people owed their first admission to political sovereignty—in part, at least, to this cause, though the proceedings of Kleisthenes indicate a hearty and spontaneous popular sentiment. But such constitutional admission of the people would not have been so astonishingly fruitful in positive results, if the course of public events for the half century after Kleisthenes had not been such as to concentrate most powerfully their energy, their self-reliance, their mutual sympathies, and their ambition. I shall recount in a future chapter those historical causes, which, acting upon the Athenian character, gave such efficiency and expansion to the great democratical impulse communicated by Kleisthenes: at present it is enough to remark that that impulse commences properly with Kleisthenes, and not with Solon.

The real  
Athenian  
democratic  
impulse was  
Kleisthenes.

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, i. 62. the Athenian people, expelled from everything, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, i. 62. 63. When at Athens Kleisthenes and Isagoras determined that Isagoras' descendants, in a minority of the three hundred, should

<sup>3</sup> See also the Athenian History, especially the account, etc.

the actual operations, Kleisthenes' complete participation, etc. See also the first speech, which describes the circumstances.

As to the indirect democratical tendency of the proceedings of Kleisthenes, see Aristotle, Politics, ii. 2, 11; iii. 2, 12.





prerogatives and further strengthened by its indispensable city—the *pro-bouleutes* or *pro-considering senate*. Under the Solonian constitution, this force was merely secondary and defensive, but after the reversion of Kleisthenes it became permanent and sovereign. It branched out gradually into those numerous popular *dikasteria* which so powerfully modified both public and private Athenian life, drew to itself the undivided reverence and subsistence of the people, and by degrees rendered the single magistracies essentially subordinate functions. The popular assembly, as constituted by Solon, appearing in modified efficiency and trained to the office of reviewing and judging the general conduct of a past magistrate—forms the intermediate stage between the passive Homeric ages, and those unimpotent *arctia* and *diastasia* which listened to Perikles or Demosthenes. Compared with these last, it has in it but a faint streak of democracy—and so it naturally appeared to Aristotle, who wrote with a practical experience of Athens in the time of the orators; but compared with the first, or with the ante-Solonian constitution of Attica, it must doubtless have appeared a revolution unutterably democratised. To impose upon the *Eupatrid* either the necessity of being elected, or yet upon his trial of after-accountability, by the rabble of *thetes* (such would be the phrase in *Eupatrid* society), would be a bitter humiliation to those among whom it was first introduced; for we must recollect that this was the most extreme scheme of constitutional reform yet propounded in Greece, and that dispute and obloquy shared between them at that time the whole Grecian world. As it appears that Solon, while constituting the popular assembly with its *pro-bouleutes* senate, had no jealousy of the senate of *Areopagus*, and indeed even enlarged its powers—we may infer that his great object was, not to weaken the oligarchy generally, but to improve the administration and to repress the intemperance and irregularities of the individual members; and that too, not by diminishing their powers, but by making some degree of popularity the condition both of their entry into office, and of their safety or honour after it.

body of 4000, who various bodies of  
before the different courts and purposes  
did not increase, probably, until

after the first reform of Kleisthenes  
I think, or the increase when I think  
upon the later and last days.

It is, in my judgment, a mistake to suppose that Solon transferred the judicial power of the archons to a popular assembly. These magistracies still continued self-acting judges deciding and condemning without appeal—not mere presidents of an assembled jury, as they afterwards came to be during the next century.<sup>1</sup> For the general exercise of such power they were accountable after their year of office. Such accountability was the security against abuse—a very insufficient security, yet not wholly inoperative. It will be seen however presently that these archons, though strong in courage, and perhaps in energy, small and poor men, had no means of keeping down rebellious nobles of their own rank, such as Peisistratus, Lycurgus, and Nephelids, each with his armed followers. When we compare the driven course of these ambitious competitors, ending in the deposition of one of them, with the vehement parliamentary strife between Themistocles and Alcibiades afterwards, peacefully decided by the vote of the sovereign people and never disturbing the public tranquillity—we shall see that the democracy of the ensuing century fulfilled the conditions of order, as well as of progress, better than the Solonian constitution.

To distinguish this Solonian constitution from the democracy which followed it, is essential to a due comprehension of the progress of the Greek mind, and especially of Athenian affairs. That democracy was achieved by gradual steps, which will be

<sup>1</sup> The character of Peisistratus, and much more so sprung from the character of the people in the judgment of the popular assembly (Diodorus Siculus, lib. vi.) is illustrated by another illustration through the mythical story in which he is portrayed. It is by the casting of the stones in judgment of several conspirators by the people (Hæc. of Athens, vol. ii. p. 48, &c.).

It is not to suppose that the Athenian people were not really judges in appeal, but that as it was, the deposition of an appeal from the judgment of the archon is inconsistent with the history of the course of Athenian government, and has apparently no place in Peisistratus' actual line of conduct with the Athenian people, which really was an appeal from the judgment of the council to that of the people. Peisistratus' comparison of himself with

Peisistratus leads to this conclusion—*that* the Athenian people, according to the story, were not really judges, though Peisistratus, the Athenian archon, was first a judge without appeal, and afterwards, owing to his being the chosen president of a tribunal, for trying only those conspirators who were brought to the altar from him to the assembly. And he does not even say he gave them a judge without appeal.

It is hardly just to Peisistratus to make him responsible for the arrest of the archon that Solon intended he have absolutely chosen, in order that the archon might have more to do and greater power. He gives the remedy, however, only with the most negative expression, "if it were," and he does not state whether it was ever actually brought even by the nation, whereas he may have been.



and judicial arrangements had undergone a revolution,<sup>1</sup> not less complete and meritorious than the character and spirit of the Athenian people generally. The choice, by way of lot, of archons and other magistrates—and the distribution, by lot, of the general body of citizens or persons into panels for judicial business—may be decidedly considered as not belonging to Solon, but adopted after the revolution of Kleisthenes,<sup>2</sup> probably the choice of senators by lot also. The lot was a symptom of pronounced democratical spirit, such as we must not seek in the Solonian institutions.

It is not easy to make out distinctly what was the political position of the ancient Gentes and Phratries, as Solon left them. The four tribes consisted altogether of gentes and phratries, inasmuch that no one could be included in any one of the tribes who was not also a member of some gens and phratry. Now the new probouleutic or preconsidering senate consisted of 400 members,—100 from each of the tribes: persons not included in any gens or phratry would therefore have had no access to it. The conditions of eligibility were similar, according to ancient custom, for the nine archons—of course, also, for the senate of Areopagus. So that those remained only the public assembly, in which an Athenian not a member of these tribes could take part: yet he was a citizen, since he could give his vote for archons and senators, and could take part in the annual decision of their accountability, besides being entitled to claim redress for wrong from the archons in his own person—while the alien could only do so through the intervention of an availing citizen or *Prostates*. It seems therefore that all persons not included in the four tribes, whatever their grade or fortune might be, were on the same level in respect to political privileges as the fourth and poorest class of the Solonian census. It has already been remarked, that even before the time of Solon, the number of Athenians not included in the gentes or phratries was probably considerable; it tended to become greater and greater, since these bodies grew close and unresponsive, while the policy of the new

*Gentes and Phratries exist in the Athenian constitution, but the lot of persons included in them.*

<sup>1</sup> *Diogenes Laërtius*, *Life of Solon*, c. 1. *Thucydides*, *History of Greece*, vol. II, c. 65, p. 26, last ed.

<sup>2</sup> *Diogenes Laërtius*, *Life of Solon*, c. 1.

lawgiver tended to invite industrious settlers from other parts of Greece to Athens. Such great and increasing inequality of political privileges helps to explain the weakness of the government in repelling the aggressions of Persians, and exhibits the importance of the revolution afterwards wrought by Kleisthenes, when he abolished (for all political purposes) the four old tribes, and created ten new comprehensive tribes in place of them.

In regard to the regulations of the senate and the assembly of the people, as constituted by Solon, we are altogether without information: nor is it safe to transfer to the Solonian constitution the information, comparatively ample, which we possess respecting these bodies under the later democracy.

The laws of Solon were inscribed on wooden rollers and  
 preserved in the temple of Athena Polias, in the species of writing called

*Isotrophion* (lines alternating first from left to right, and next from right to left, like the course of the ploughman), and preserved first in the Akropolis, subsequently in the Prytaneum. On the tablets, called *Kyria*, were chiefly enumerated the laws respecting moral rites and sacrifices: <sup>1</sup> on the pillars or rollers, of which there were at least sixteen, were placed the regulations respecting matters profane. So small are the fragments which have come down to us, and so much has been ascribed to Solon by the writers which belongs really to the subsequent times, that it is hardly possible to form any correct judgment respecting the legislation as a whole, or to discover by what general principles or purposes he was guided.

He left unchanged all the previous laws and practices respecting the crime of homicide, connected as they were intimately with the religious feelings of the people.

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Solon, 24-25. He probably withdrew the statutes from the temple after consulting the oracle, but he took care that the city should also possess the statute, for in 25, the oracle itself is said to be responsible. <sup>2</sup> See also Plutarch, Solon, 24-25.

<sup>3</sup> These fragments of laws, written upon rollers, are the laws of Solon, as they are called in the ancient writers. The fragments of the laws of Solon, as they are called in the ancient writers, are the laws of Solon, as they are called in the ancient writers.

<sup>4</sup> Plutarch, Solon, 24-25. He probably withdrew the statutes from the temple after consulting the oracle, but he took care that the city should also possess the statute, for in 25, the oracle itself is said to be responsible.

<sup>5</sup> Plutarch, Solon, 24-25. He probably withdrew the statutes from the temple after consulting the oracle, but he took care that the city should also possess the statute, for in 25, the oracle itself is said to be responsible. <sup>6</sup> Plutarch, Solon, 24-25. He probably withdrew the statutes from the temple after consulting the oracle, but he took care that the city should also possess the statute, for in 25, the oracle itself is said to be responsible.

The law of Drills on this subject, therefore, remained, but on other subjects, according to Planché, they were altogether abrogated; there is however room for supposing that the repeal cannot have been so sweeping as this biographer represents.

The Bolivian laws seem to have borne more or less upon all the great departments of human interest and duty. We find regulations political and religious, public and private, civil and criminal, commercial, agricultural, sanitary, and disciplinary. Solís provides punishment for crimes; restricts the profession and status of the citizen, prescribes detailed rules for marriage as well as for burial, for the common use of springs and wells, and for the mutual interest of contemporaneous farmers in planting or hedging their properties. As far as we can judge from the important manner in which his laws come before us, there does not seem to have been any attempt at a systematic order or classification. Some of them are more general and vague directions, while others again run into the extreme of specificity.

By far the most important of all was the amendment of the law of father and brother which has already been adverted to, and the abolition of the power of fathers and brothers to sell their daughters and sisters into slavery. The prohibition of all contracts on the security of the body was itself sufficient to produce a vast improvement in the character and condition of the poorer population,—a result which seems to have been so readily obtained, from the legislation of Solís, that Bowth and some other ancient authors suppose him to have abolished villanage and transferred upon the poor tenants a property in their lands, annulling the seigniorial rights of the landlord. But this opinion rests upon no positive evidence, nor are we warranted in ascribing to him any stronger measure in reference to the land than the amendment of the previous mortgage.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Planché, *Bolivia*, p. 27; CYRIL and JULIAN, p. 2, 106, in *England*. The suppression of the different vassalial jurisdictions for landless, which we find in Germany, and elsewhere, p. 417, seems rather an extreme and unnecessary step for the sake of Drills, if only these laws, according to Planché, or perhaps Bowth, got rid of them in Bolivia.

<sup>2</sup> Bowth, *Bolivia*, Public Economy of the Agriculture, vol. II, and L. THOMSON, *Orchardists' Handbook*, p. 191; and Planché have supposed them abolished. Planché, p. 2, at least, seems to expect a law to limit the quantity of land which any individual citizen might acquire. But the proposition just stated is not in any way based on evidence.



This municipal prohibition is founded on principles substantially similar to those which were acted upon in the early history of England, with reference both to corn and to wool, and in other European countries also. In so far as it was at all operative it tended to lessen the total quantity of produce raised upon the soil of Attica, and thus to keep the price of it from rising,—a purpose less objectionable (if we assume that the legislator is to interfere at all) than that of our late Corn Laws, which were destined to prevent the price of grain from falling. But the law of Solon must have been altogether inoperative, in reference to the great articles of human subsistence; for Attica imported both largely and constantly, grain and salt provisions,—probably also wool and flax for the spinning and weaving of the women, and certainly timber for building. Whether the law was ever enforced with reference to figs and honey, may well be doubted; at least these productions of Attica were in after-times generally consumed and celebrated throughout Greece. Probably also in the time of Solon, the olive-trees of Laurium had hardly begun to be worked; these afterwards became highly productive, and furnished to Athens a commodity for foreign payments not less convenient than lucrative.\*

It is interesting to notice the anxiety, both of Solon and of Draco, to enforce among their fellow-citizens industriousness and self-maintaining habits;† and we shall find the same sentiment proclaimed by Pericles, at the time when Athenian power was at its maridian. Nor ought we to pass over this early manifestation in Attica of an opinion equitable and tolerant towards manufacturing industry, which in most other parts of Greece was regarded as comparatively dishonourable. The general tone of Grecian sentiment recognised no occupations as perfectly worthy of a free citizen except arms, agriculture, and athletic and musical exercises; and the proceedings of the Spartans, who

\* See, for it is likely, that Solon has introduced this law from Egypt.

According to Pausanias, Solon was anxious to be regarded as doing good through his laws, and he has, under Solon, his regulations generally with reference to the peace who had been appointed at it of three generations previous. See

Herodotus, *lib. ii. c. 17*; and the "Apology" of the same author, *c. 32* and *33*; and Xenoph. *Eclog. i. c. 10*.

† Xenophon, *de Virtute, lib. i. c. 1*.  
 ‡ Pausanias, *de Vita Solonis*, mentions that Pericles, in his capacity of legislator, was anxious, that of his father's laws should be



kept aloof even from agriculture and left it to their *Hoplites*, were admired, though they could not be copied, throughout many part of the Hellenic world. Even inside like Plato, Aristotle, and Xenophon assented to a nonfarmatic extent in this feeling, which they justified on the ground that the sedentary life and increasing house-work of the artisans were inconsistent with military aptitude. The town-occupations are usually described by a word which carries with it contemptuous ideas, and though recognized as indispensable to the existence of the city, are held suitable only for an inferior and nonprivileged order of citizens. This, the received sentiment among Greeks, as well as foreigners, found a strong and growing opposition at Athens, as I have already said—corroborated also by a similar feeling at Corinth.<sup>1</sup> The taste of Corinth, as well as of Chalkis in Eubœa, was extensive, at a time when that of Athens had scarce any existence. But while the despotism of Pericles can hardly have failed to operate as a discouragement to industry at Corinth, the contemporaneous legislation of Solon provided for traders and artisans a new home at Athens, giving the first encouragement to that numerous town-population both in the city and in the *Peisnessa*, which we find actually residing there in the succeeding century. The multiplication of such town residents, both citizens and metics (i.e. resident persons, not citizens, but enjoying an assured position and civil rights), was a capital fact in the outward march of Athens, since it determined not merely the extension of her trade, but also the pre-eminence of her moral force—and thus, as a farther consequence, her extraordinary vigour to her democratical government. It seems moreover to have been a departure from the primitive temper of Atticism, which tended both to national residence and rural occupation. We have therefore the greater interest in noting the first mention of it as a consequence of the Solonian legislation.

To Solon is first owing the abolition of a power of testamentary bequest at Athens, in all cases in which a man had no legitimate children. According to the pre-existing custom, we may rather

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, II. 147—150; Xenophon, *Constitution*, II. 1.

The following sentence, however, which Aristotle has taken from Plato as a source, and upon which he has

long-makes, proves that if any such Solonian proposal to prohibit the party apparently derived nothing of the old sentiment according to laws it is just reversed against them.



doubtful.<sup>3</sup> Solim, it appears, was the first who gave power of supererogating by testament the rights of agnates and gentiles to successors,—a proceeding in consonance with his plan of encouraging both industrious occupation and the consequent multiplication of individual acquisitions.<sup>4</sup>

It has been already mentioned that Solim forbade the sale of daughters or wives into slavery by fathers or brothers; <sup>Law relating to women.</sup> a prohibition, which shows how much females had before been looked upon as articles of property. And it would seem that before his time the violation of a free woman must have been punished at the discretion of the magistrate; for we are told that he was the first who enacted a penalty of 100 drachms against the offender, and 50 drachms against the seducer of a free woman.<sup>5</sup> Moreover it is said that he forbade a bride when given in marriage to carry with her any personal ornaments and appurtenances, except to the extent of three robes and certain measures of furniture not very valuable.<sup>6</sup> Solim <sup>Superstition civil, female.</sup> further imposed upon women several restrictions in regard to proceeding at the obsequies of deceased relatives. He forbade profane demonstrations of sorrow, singing of composed songs, and costly uniforms and contributions. He limited strictly the quantity of meat and drink admissible for the funeral banquet, and prohibited nocturnal exit, except in a car and with a light. It appears that both in Greece and Rome, the feelings of duty and affection on the part of surviving relatives prompted them to various expenses in a funeral, as well as to unmeasured effusions both of grief and irritability; and the general sensibility experienced for legal restriction is attested by the remark of Plutarch, that similar

<sup>3</sup>See the Dissertation of Boisson, *De Jure Testamentariorum Adherentium*, pp. 44, 45, and *Memoriae Solimanici*, in *Plinius Epistolæ* ap. Grot. lib. 1, tit. 1, c. 27.

<sup>4</sup>He adopted any man not allowed to begeth by will that property of which he died and made him the possessor; if he left no legitimate children, the laws as law of the empire declared to him right-possessor that, says Boisson, p. 1189, post. *Epistolæ*, lib. 1, p. 120, *Epistolæ*, of sup. p. 21-42.

<sup>5</sup>Plutarch, *Solim*, 11. et *gentium, solimanici legibus* *Epistolæ*.

<sup>6</sup>According to *Epistolæ*, *Post. Epistolæ*, pp. 21-22, the restriction enacted by Solim against the women, robes, or jewelry, in such cases of matrimony, was made.

<sup>7</sup>Plutarch, *Solim*, 11. These laws were interpretations of the laws of the Solim, for which the historian, when he related it, expressly gave authority, and quoted it in the sequel as the law of the Solim, says Boisson, *De Jure Civili*, lib. 1, p. 12.

prohibitions to those enacted by Ndon. were likewise in force at the native town of Churusi.<sup>1</sup>

Other paid entertainments of Solon are yet to be mentioned. He forbade slandersly evil speaking with respect to the Athenians abroad. He forbade it likewise with respect to the Athenians at home, either in a temple or before judges or arbiters, or at any public festival—on pain of a forfeit of three drachms to the person aggrieved, and two more to the public treasury. How mild the general character of his punishments was, may be judged by this law against foul language, not less than by the law before-mentioned against rape. Both the one and the other of these offences were much more severely dealt with under the subsequent law of democratic Athens. The punishment which applied

2. Edwards, L. A. The influence of altitude on the spread of *Parascaris* spp. to a great degree relied on the feeding habits of sheep. *Int. Assoc. Parasitol.*

On June 27, 1976, the decedent died, eight days before the trial, and the jury was a long time to respond to the defendant's testimony. Judge Sullivan announced that, after finding the proper amount of interest upon a principal sum amounting to the value of the decedent (app. 20, 21, 22).

<sup>1</sup> *Compendio de Hist. Natur. de p. 1771* (see also p. 1771 for *Compendio de Hist. Natur. de p. 1771*).

Unusually, because of job types, the female sex is overrepresented in the lowest income levels. The female sex is also overrepresented in the middle income levels, but underrepresented in the highest income levels. The female sex is also overrepresented in the lowest income levels, but underrepresented in the highest income levels.

[illegible]

And it's easy to understand this feeling, whether we suppose the windows are full of completely transparent or flame-retardant, at least we need the windows along the College Entrance of the

Students' responses showed that they did not accept the situation, as the achievement of equality, education and discipline should be the primary criteria, not the status of the teacher. (p. 10, emphasis added)

<sup>22</sup> The mathematics teacher is a resource upon which he relies to help provide the results of the experiment is based on the construction of numbers.

One of the most vibrant parts of the country, the region which has been labeled as experiencing large areas of "rapid" economic expansion, is also the area which has been labeled as experiencing large areas of "rapid" economic contraction. The region which has been labeled as experiencing large areas of "rapid" economic expansion is also the area which has been labeled as experiencing large areas of "rapid" economic contraction.

[illegible]

speaking ill of a deceased person, though doubtless springing in a great degree from disinterested repugnance, is treatable also in part to that fear of the wrath of the departed which strongly possessed the early Greek mind.

It seems generally that Solon determined by law the outlay for the public sacrifices, though we do not know what were his particular directions. We are told that he rewarded a sheep and a measure (of wheat or barley?) as equivalent, either of them, to a drachm, and that he also provided the prizes to be paid for first-rate work intended for solemn occasions. But it astonishes us to see the large recompense which he awarded out of the public treasury to a victor at the Olympic or Isthmian games: to the former-400 drachms, equal to one year's income of the highest of the four classes in the census; to the latter 100 drachms. The magnitude of these rewards strikes us the more when we compare them with the fines on rape and evil speaking. We cannot be surprised that the philosopher Xenophanes noticed, with some degree of severity, the extravagant estimate of this species of excellence, current among the Grecian cities.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, we must remember both that these Pan-Hellenic sacred games presented the chief visible evidence of peace and sympathy among the numerous communities of Greece, and that in the time of Solon, institutions reward was still useful to encourage them. In respect to land and agriculture Solon proclaimed a public reward of five drachms for every wolf brought in, and one drachm for every spittle-worm: the extent of wild land has at all times been considerable in Attica. He also provided rules respecting the use of walls between neighbours, and respecting the planting in contentious sward-grounds. Whether any of these regulations continued in operation during the better-known period of Athenian history cannot be easily affirmed.<sup>2</sup>

In respect to theft, we find it stated that Solon repealed the punishment of death which Draco had annexed to that crime, and created as a penalty, compensation to an amount double the value of the property stolen. The difficulty

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Solon, c. 12. Xenophanes, *Mem. (Hag. L. i. 23)*.  
 Pres. L. of Hippodamides. In Diogenes  
 is to be found, the proverbial word very  
 large estimate to Solon. he retained.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, Solon, c. 12. See Solon,  
 Aristotle.

of this law perhaps affords ground for presuming that it really does belong to Solon. But the law which provided during the time of the reforms respecting death<sup>1</sup> must have been introduced at some later period, since it enters into distinctions and mentions both places and forms of procedure, which we cannot reasonably refer to the forty-sixth Olympiad. The public dinners at the Prytaneum, of which the archons and a select few partook as common, were also either first established, or perhaps only more strictly regulated, by Solon. His ordered barley-cakes for their ordinary meals, and wheaten loaves for festival days, prescribing how often each person should dine at the table.<sup>2</sup> The honour of dining at the table of the Prytaneum was maintained throughout as a valuable reward at the disposal of the government.

Among the various laws of Solon, there are few which have attracted more notice than that which pronounced the man, who in a sedition stood aloof and took part with neither side, to be dishonoured and dishonourised.<sup>3</sup> Strictly speaking, this seems more in the nature of an emphatic moral denunciation, or a religious curse, than a legal sanction capable of being formally applied in an individual case and after judicial trial,—though the sentence of *Ateia*, under the more elaborated *Athen* procedure, was both definite in its penal consequences and also judicially delivered. We may however follow the course of ideas under which Solon was induced to write this sentence on his tables, and

course  
pronounced  
by Solon  
after  
deliberation  
was  
in a sentence.

<sup>1</sup> See the laws in Demosthenes, *cont. Neerachid.* p. 330-331. The *epitaphium* by the citizens, both of *Neerachid* (*Neerachidion* in Solon's law) and of *Meles* (*Melesion* in Pausanias, p. 309), I myself translate according to the sense of these laws as to be dishonoured.—One includes a note of public property for which dishonoured for that day (*Neerachid* p. 330). The word *epitaphium* belongs to Solon, and probably the phrase, "to be dishonoured" is from the citizens, for the word *epitaphium* has not been used since he had died.

<sup>2</sup> See also, *cont. Neerachid*, p. 331, the words, "to be dishonoured" in the sentence that, when he has died, it is ordered that Solon was to be dishonoured for his law, and that he was to be dishonoured for his law, and that he was to be dishonoured for his law.

In another part of his work, he speaks of *Neerachid*, but does not mention the word *epitaphium* as the sentence of *Neerachid* is in the law.

<sup>3</sup> See, in his laws, *cont. Neerachid* the words, "to be dishonoured" in the sentence of *Neerachid* (*Neerachidion* in Pausanias, p. 309). In the law, *cont. Neerachid*, p. 330, it was also the sentence of *Neerachid* (*Neerachidion* in Pausanias, p. 309). In the law, *cont. Neerachid*, p. 330, it was also the sentence of *Neerachid* (*Neerachidion* in Pausanias, p. 309). In the law, *cont. Neerachid*, p. 330, it was also the sentence of *Neerachid* (*Neerachidion* in Pausanias, p. 309).

<sup>4</sup> See also, *cont. Neerachid*, p. 331, the words, "to be dishonoured" in the sentence that, when he has died, it is ordered that Solon was to be dishonoured for his law, and that he was to be dishonoured for his law, and that he was to be dishonoured for his law.

<sup>5</sup> See also, *cont. Neerachid*, p. 331, the words, "to be dishonoured" in the sentence that, when he has died, it is ordered that Solon was to be dishonoured for his law, and that he was to be dishonoured for his law, and that he was to be dishonoured for his law.

we may trace the influence of similar ideas to later Attic institutions. It is obvious that his demagoguism is confined to that special case in which a rebellion has already broken out: we must suppose that Kylon has seized the Akropolis, or that Peisistratos, Megakles, and Lykourgos, are in arms at the head of their partisans. Assuming these leaders to be wealthy and powerful men, which would in all probability be the fact, the constitutional authority—such as Solon saw before him in Attika, even after his own expatrie amendments—was not strong enough to maintain the peace; it became in fact itself one of the contending parties. Under such given circumstances, the sooner every citizen publicly declared his adherence to some one of them, the earlier this suspension of legal authority was likely to terminate. Nothing was so mischievous as the indifference of the mass, or their disposition to let the combatants fight out the matter among themselves, and then to submit to the victor.<sup>1</sup> Nothing was more likely to encourage aggression on the part of an ambitious malcontent than the conviction, that if he could once overpower the small amount of physical force which surrounded the archons, and exhibit himself in armed possession of the Prytaneion or the Akropolis, he might immediately exact upon passive submission on the part of all the freemen without. Under the state of feeling which Solon incited, the insurgent leader would have to calculate that every man, who was not actively in his favour would be actively against him, and this would render his enterprise much more dangerous. Indeed he could then never hope to succeed, except on the double supposition of extraordinary popularity in his own person, and wide-spread deterioration of the existing government. He would thus be placed under the influence of powerful stirring motives; so that rebellion would be less likely to induce him into a course which threatened nothing but ruin, unless under such encouragement from the pre-existing public opinion as to make his success a realisable prospect for the community. Among the small political societies of Greece—especially in the age of Solon, when the number of despots in other parts of Greece seems to have been at its maximum—every government, whatever might be its form, was violently weak to

<sup>1</sup> This is one of many indications manifested by the people of Argos in Euripides' *Life of Agamemnon*, v. 12.

make its overthrow a matter of comparative facility. Unless upon the supposition that a band of foreign mercenaries—which would render the government-system of nihilism, and which the Athenians long after would of course never contemplate—there was an other step for it except a positive and pronounced feeling of attachment on the part of the mass of citizens. Indifference on their part would render them a prey to every daring man of wealth, who chose to become a conspirator. That they should be ready to come forward, not only with votes but with arms—and that they should be known beforehand to be so—was essential to the maintenance of every good Greek government. It was salutary, in preventing mere personal attempts at revolution; and pacific in its tendency, even when the revolution had actually broken out—because in the greater number of cases the proportion of partisans would probably be very unequal, and the inferior party would be compelled to renounce their hopes.

It will be observed that in this enactment of Solon, the existing government is treated merely as one of the contending parties. The virtuous citizen is required, not to come forward in its support, but to come forward at all events, either for it or against it. Positive and early action is all which is presented to him as matter of duty. In the age of Solon, there was no political class or system yet current which could be assumed as an unquestionable datum—no conspicuous standard to which the citizens could be pledged under all circumstances to stick themselves. The option lay only between a mitigated oligarchy in possession and a danger in possibility; a contest wherein the affections of the people could rarely be excited upon in favour of the established government. But this neutrality in respect to the constitution was at an end, after the revolution of Kleisthenes, when the idea of the sovereignty of the people and the democratic institutions became both familiar and precious to every individual citizen. We shall hereafter find the Athenians binding themselves by the most solemn and solemn oaths to uphold their democracy against all attempts to subvert it; we shall discover in them a sentiment not less positive and uncompromising in its direction,

Secondly, upon this Greek city, the republicans of some positive sentiment as the part of the citizens.

Contract in this respect between the age of Solon and the subsequent democracy.



their energies in its inspiration. But while we notice this very important change in their character, we shall at the same time perceive that the wise precautionary recommendation of Solon, to abstain entirely by an early declaration of the impartiality between two contending leaders, was not lost upon them. Such,

as point of fact, was the purpose of that salutary and protective institution which is called the Ostracism. When two party leaders, in the early stages of the Athenian democracy, each powerful in influence and influence, had become passionately embarked in bitter and prolonged opposition to each other, such opposition was likely to conduct one or other to violent measures. Over and above the hopes of party triumph, each might well fear that if he himself continued within the bounds of legality, he might fall a victim to aggressive proceedings on the part of his antagonist. To ward off this formidable danger, a public vote was called for to determine which of the two should go into temporary banishment, retaining his property and unaffected by any disgrace. A number of citizens not less than 6000, voting secretly and therefore independently, were required to take part, pronouncing upon one or other of these without revile a sentence of exile for ten years. The one who remained because of course more powerful, yet less in a situation to be driven into anti-constitutional excess than he was before. I shall in a future chapter speak again of this wise precaution and vindicate it against some erroneous interpretations to which it has given rise. At present I merely notice its analogy with the previous Solonian law, and its tendency to accomplish the same purpose of terminating a three party feud, by artificially calling in the votes of the mass of impartial citizens against one or other of the leaders—with this important difference, that while Solon assumed the hostile parties to be actually in arms, the ostracism averted that great public calamity by applying its remedy to the promontory symptoms.

I have already considered, in a previous chapter, the directions given by Solon for the more orderly method of the Homeric poems; and it is curious to contrast his reverence for the old epic with the unqualified repugnance which he manifested towards Thersites and the drama—then just nascent, and holding not little

displacement  
of Solon to  
mark the  
Homeric  
poems and  
the drama.

possessor of its subsequent excellence. Tragedy and comedy were now beginning to be guided on the lyric and choric song. First one actor was provided to relieve the chorus; next two actors were introduced to sustain belittled characters and carry on a dialogue, in such manner that the songs of the chorus and the interlocation of the actors formed a continuous piece. Solon, after having heard Timotheos acting (as all the early composers did, both tragic and comic) in his own comedy, asked him afterwards if he was not ashamed to pronounce such falsehoods before so large an audience. And when Timotheos answered that there was no harm in saying and doing such things merely for amusement, Solon indignantly exclaimed, striking the ground with his stick, "If done we come to praise and esteem such amusement as this, we shall quickly find the effects of it in our daily transactions". For the authenticity of this anecdote it would be rash to vouch, but we may at least treat it as the protest of some early philosopher against the dissipation of the drama; and it is interesting as marking the important struggles of that literature in which Athens afterwards obtained such unrivalled excellence.

It would appear that all the laws of Solon were proclaimed, inserted, and accepted without either discussion or resistance. He is said to have described them, not as the best laws which he could himself have imagined, but as the best which he could have induced the people to accept. He gave them validity for the space of ten years, during which period<sup>1</sup> both the senate collectively and the citizens individually swore to observe them with fidelity; under penalty, in case of non-observance, of a golden statue as large as life to be erected at Delphi. But through the acceptance of the laws was accomplished without difficulty, it was not found so easy either for the people to understand and obey, or for the farmer to explain them. Every day persons came to Solon either with praise, or criticism, or suggestions of various improvements, or questions as to the construction of particular enactments; until at last he became tired of this endless process of reply and withdrawal, which was without successful effect in removing obliquity or in satisfying complacence. Perceiving that of his

rejection of them after the acceptance of the laws, the nature from which.

<sup>1</sup>Plutarch gives 10. Diodor. Sicul. 12. 2—23

<sup>2</sup>Plutarch, Solon, 18.

permitted he would be compelled to make strings, he obtained leave of absence from his countrymen for ten years, trusting that before the expiration of that period they would have become accustomed to his laws. He quitted his native city, in the full certainty that his laws would remain unexpated until his return for (says Herodotus) "the Athenians could not repudiate them, were they were bound by solemn oaths to observe them for ten years". The unequalled manner in which the historian here speaks of an oath, as if it created a sort of physical necessity and shut out all possibility of a contrary result, deserves notice as illustrating Greek sentiment.<sup>1</sup>

On departing from Athens, Solon first visited Egypt, where he conversed largely with Pansophists of Heliopolis and Senebis of Sais, Egyptian priests who had much to tell respecting their ancient history, and from whom he learnt matters real or pretended, far transcending in alleged antiquity the oldest Greek genealogies—especially the history of the vast submerged island of Atlantis, and the war which the armators of the Atlantians had successfully carried on against it, 9000 years before. Solon is said to have commenced an epic poem upon this subject, but he did not live to finish it, and nothing of it now remains. From Egypt he went to Cyprus, where he visited the small town of Salamis, said to have been originally founded by Demophila, son of Theras, and ruled at this period by the prince Philokyprus—such towns in Cyprus having its own petty prince. It was situated upon the river Klaros in a position picturesque and secure, but inconvenient and ill-supplied. Solon persuaded Philokyprus to quit the old site and establish a new town down in the fertile plain beneath. He himself stayed and became Gliris of the new establishment, making all the regulations requisite for its safe and prosperous march, which was indeed so decidedly manifested, that many new settlers flocked into the new plantation, called by Philokyprus Soli, in honour of Solon. To our deep regret, we are not permitted to know what these regulations were; but the general

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. l. ii. Solon's reply to Pericles, in which he says, "I have no other security than my oath," is a fine illustration of the Greek sentimentality which was the basis of their law.

Herodotus, l. ii. c. 17. Solon's reply to Pericles, in which he says, "I have no other security than my oath," is a fine illustration of the Greek sentimentality which was the basis of their law.







young Lydians, in the intention of burning them alive, either as a religious offering, or in fulfilment of a vow, "or perhaps (says Herodotus) to see whether some of the girls would not prefer to escape a man so pre-eminently pious as the king of Lydia."<sup>1</sup> In this act of atrocity, Croesus brought him of the warning which he had before despised, and thence pronounced, with a deep groan, the name of Solon. Cyrus desired the interpreter to inquire whom he was invoking, and heard in reply the anecdote of the Athenian lawgiver, together with the solemn warnings which he had offered to Croesus during more prosperous days, asserting the final tenure of all human greatness. The remark went deep into the Persian monarch as a token of what might happen to himself: he reported of his purpose, and directed that the fire, which had already been kindled, should be immediately extinguished. But the orders came too late. In spite of the most valiant efforts of the Lyoneses, the flames were found unquenchable, and Croesus would still have been burnt, had he not inspired with prayer and seen the success of Apollo, to whom Delphos and Thebes temples he had given such magnificent presents. His prayers were heard, the fair sky was immediately overcast and a profuse rain descended, sufficient to extinguish the flames.<sup>2</sup> The life of Croesus was thus saved, and he became afterwards the confidential friend and adviser of his conqueror.

Such is the brief outline of a narrative which Herodotus has given with full development and with extraordinary effect. It would have served as a show-lecture to the youth of Athens not less admirably than the well-known fable of the choice of Alcibiades, which the philosopher Prodicus,<sup>3</sup> a junior contemporary of Herodotus, delivered with so much popularity. It illustrates forcibly the religious and ethical ideas of antiquity; the deep sense of the jealousy of the gods, who would not endure pride in anyone except themselves;<sup>4</sup> the impossibility, for any man, of reaching

<sup>1</sup> Herodot. l. vi. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Herodot. l. vi. 37, compare the text. See also, l. vi. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

<sup>3</sup> Herodot. Monograph. II. 1. 11. 12.

See also, l. vi. 37, compare the text. See also, l. vi. 37, compare the text. See also, l. vi. 37, compare the text.

<sup>4</sup> Herodot. vi. 34. See also, l. vi. 34, compare the text. See also, l. vi. 34, compare the text. See also, l. vi. 34, compare the text.

to himself more than a very moderate share of happiness; the danger, from reactionary Heraclea, if at any time he had experienced such luck; and the necessity of calculations taking in the whole of life, as a basis for rational comparison of different individual aims and activities, as a practical consequence from these dangers, the often-repeated protest of moralists against vehement impulses and unbalanced operations. The more valuable than narrative appears, in its illustrative character, the less can we presume to treat it as a history.

It is much to be regretted that we have no information respecting events in Attica immediately after the Solonian laws and constitution, which were promulgated in 594 B.C., so as to understand better the practical effect of these changes. What we must bear respecting Solon in Attica refers to a period immediately preceding the first usurpation of Peisistratus in 560 B.C., and after the return of Solon from his long exile. We are here again introduced to the same oligarchical dissensions as are reported to have prevailed before the Solonian legislation: the Peisians, or ancient proprietors of the plain round Athens, under Lykurgos; the Poenai, or the north of Attica, under Megakles; and the Dekastai or mountaineers of the eastern cantons, the poorest of the three classes, under Peisistratos, are in a state of violent intestine dispute. The account of Peisistratos represents Solon as returning to Athens during the height of this rebellion. He was treated with respect by all parties, but his recommendations were no longer obeyed, and he was disqualified by age from acting with effect in politics. He employed his best efforts to mitigate party animosities, and applied himself particularly to restrain the ambition of Peisistratos, whose ulterior projects he quickly detected.

The future greatness of Peisistratos is said to have been first portended by a miracle which happened, even before his birth, to his father Hippocleides at the Olympic games. It was realised, partly by his bravery and conduct, which had been displayed in the capture of Miletus from the Megarians.

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, l. iii. I moved this also. Herodotus; and because it may possibly be shown that the Megarians were, after their capture, taken into Athens and stayed there for some time. I have it distinctly stated in Herodotus that Peisistratos was taken from Athens and stayed there for







appeal, he put on his armor and placed himself in military posture before the door of his house. "I have done my duty," he exclaimed at length; "I have sustained to the best of my power my country and the law;" and he then renewed all former hope of opposition—though reminding the instances of his friends that he should flee, and returning for answer, when they asked him on what he relied for protection, "On my old age." Nor did he even think it necessary to repress the inspirations of his Muse. Some verses yet remain, composed eveningly at a moment when the strong band of the new danger had begun to make itself sorely felt, in which he tells his countryman—"If ye have endured sorrow from your own baseness of soul, impute not the fault of this to the gods. Ye have yourselves put fire and destruction into the hands of these men, and have thus driven upon yourselves wretched slavery."

It is gratifying to learn that Fannistrus, whose conduct throughout his despotism was comparatively mild, left Solon unharmed. How long the distinguished man survived the protracted subversion of his own constitution, we cannot certainly determine; but according to the most probable statement he died during the very next year, at the advanced age of eighty.

We have only to regret that we are deprived of the means of following more in detail his noble and exemplary character. He represents the best tendencies of his age, combined with much that is personally excellent; the improved ethical sensibility; the thirst for enlarged knowledge and observation, not less potent in old age than in youth; the conception of regularized popular institutions, departing sensibly from the type and spirit of the governments around him, and calculated to found a new character in the Athenian people; a genuine and reflecting sympathy with the mass of the poor, anxious not merely to rescue them from the oppressions of the rich, but also to create in them habits of self-raising industry; lastly, during his temporary possession of a power altogether arbitrary, not merely an absence of all selfish ambition, but a rare discretion in seeing the mean between conflicting exigencies. In reading his poems we must always reflect that what now appears common-place was once new, so that to his comparatively unblemished age, the moral precepts which

he drew wonderful truth, and his exhortations calculated to fix in the memory. The poems composed on moral subjects generally imparts a spirit of gentleness towards others and moderation in personal objects. They represent the gods as irresistible, reticentive, favouring the good and punishing the bad, though sometimes very tacitly. But his compositions on special and present occasions are usually conceived in a more vigorous spirit: denouncing the oppressions of the rich at one time, and the fatal influence to Persepolis at another—and expressing in emphatic language his own proud consciousness of having stood forward as champion of the mass of the people. Of his early poems hardly anything is preserved. The few lines remaining seem to manifest a fervid temperament which we may well conceive to have been overclouded by such political difficulties as he had to encounter—difficulties arising successively out of the Megarian war, the Elysiac sorcery, the public dependency heaped by Spemondia, and the task of whetor between a rapacious oligarchy and a suffering people. In one of his elegies addressed to Mnestheus, he marked out the sixtieth year as the longest desirable period of life, in preference to the eightieth year, which that poet had expressed a wish to attain.<sup>1</sup> But his own life, as far as we can judge, seems to have reached the longer of the two periods; and not the least honorable part of it (the resistance to Peisistratus) occurs immediately before his death.

There prevailed a story, that his ashes were collected and scattered around the island of Salamis, which Plutarch treats as absurd—though he tells us at the same time that it was believed both by Aristotle and by many other considerable men. It is at least as ancient as the poet Kallinos, who alluded to it in one of his comedies, and I do not feel inclined to reject it.<sup>2</sup> The inscription on the statue of Solon at Athens described him as a Salamian: he had been the great means of acquiring the island for his country: and it seems highly probable that among the new Athenian citizens, who went to settle there, he may have received a lot of land and become enrolled among the Salamian

<sup>1</sup> *Idylls*, Fragment 20, ed. Bough. *Islands*, Ch. vi. De Persepolis, p. 444; p. 445 *Idylls*.  
*Islands* allude that Solon was the  
 first person to whom the application  
 of the word *Salamin* was applied. The  
 first story of Solon was applied to  
 Solon, Ch. vi. De Persepolis, p. 444; p. 445 *Idylls*.  
<sup>2</sup> *Islands*, Solon, vi. Kallinos ap.  
 Plutarch, Solon, 2, 11.

demote. The disposition of his ashes, connecting him with the island as its chief, may be construed, if not as the expression of a public vote, at least as a proof of affectionate anxiety on the part of his surviving friends.<sup>1</sup>

We have now reached the period of the usurpation of Peisistratus (B.C. 545), whose Dynasty governed Athens (with two temporary interruptions during the life of Peisistratus himself) for fifty years. The history of this despotism, unlike that of other despots generally, and productive of important consequences to Athens, will be reserved for a succeeding chapter.

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, in relating this story of the revivification of the ashes of Solon in Sicily, calls him an *Agroterus* of the island (Gen. 273. 274) the meaning, p. 170, p. 171, *Island*. The description of his ashes, which describes him as born in Sicily, can hardly have been literally true; for

when he was born, Sicily was not incorporated in Athens. But it may have been true by a sort of adoption (see Deque, *Levi* 1. 17). The ashes were of course being referred to the Solonians themselves, a long time after Solon's own death at Megara (Levi 1. 2).

## APPENDIX.

The explanation which M. van Savigny gives of the *Twelve Tables* under the old Roman law of debts and creditors (after he has related the classification of *Statutus* on the same subject), while it throws great light on the historical changes in Roman legislation on that important matter, sets forth at the same time the marked difference made in the procedure of Rome, between the demand of the creditor for repayment of principal, and the demand for payment of interest.

The primitive Roman law distinguished a debt arising from money lent (*pecunia crederi credita*) from debts arising out of contract, delict, sale, &c., or any other source: the creditor on the former ground had a *quirit* and *manu process*, by which he acquired the fullest power over the person and property of his debtor. After the debt on loan was either confessed or proved before the magistrate, thirty days were allowed to the debtor for payment. If payment was not made within that time, the creditor laid hold of him (*manus injectio*) and carried him before the magistrate again. The debtor was now again required either to pay or to find a surety (*vindex*); if neither of these demands were complied with, the creditor took possession of him and carried him home, where he kept him in chains for two months; during which he might be brought him before the praetor publicly on three successive occasions. If the debt was not paid within those two months, the sentence of addition was pronounced, and the creditor became empowered either to put his debtor to death, or to sell him for a slave (p. 41), or to keep him at forced work, without any restriction as to the degree of ill-treatment which might be inflicted upon him. The judgment of the magistrate authorized him, besides, to seize the property of his debtor wherever he could find any, within the limits sufficient for payment: this was one of the points which *Statutus* had denied.

Such was the old law of Rome, with respect to the consequences of an action for money lent and received, far more than a century after the *Twelve Tables*. But the law did not apply the stringent personal sanction to any debt except that arising from loan—and even in that

debt only to the principal money, not to the interest—which latter had to be cleared by a person both more gentle and less abundant, applying to the property only and not to the person of the debtor. Accordingly it was to the advantage of the creditor to derive some means for satisfying his claims of interest under the same stringent process as his claim for the principal; it was also to his advantage, if his claim arose, not out of money lent, but out of sale, compensation for injury, or any other source, to give it in the form of an action for money lent. Now the *Nexum*, or *Nexi obligatio*, was an action—a fictitious loan—whereby this purpose was accomplished. The action process which legally belonged only to the recovery of the principal money, was extended by the *Nexum* so as to comprehend the interest; and so as to comprehend also claims for money arising from all other sources (as well as from loan), whence the law gave no direct recourse strictly against the property of a debtor. The Debitor *Nexum* was made liable by this legal action to pass into the condition of an *Adilectus*, others without having borrowed money at all, or for the interest as well as for the principal of that which he had borrowed.

The *Lex Poetelia*, passed about B.C. 338, liberated all the *Nexi* then under liability, and interdicted the *Nexi obligatio* for ever afterwards (Gloss, *De Repudiis* l. 34; Livy, viii. 33). Here, as in the *Interdictio* of *Seils*, the existing contracts were cancelled, at the same time that the whole class of similar contracts were forbidden for the future.

But though the *Nexi obligatio* was then abolished, the old stringent remedy still continued against the debtor as loan, as far as the principal was borrowed, apart from interest. Some mitigations were introduced: by *Lex Julia*, the still more important provision was added, that the debtor by means of a *Census* Decretum might save his person from seizure. But the *Census* Decretum was coupled with conditions which could not always be fulfilled, nor was the debtor admitted to the benefit of it, if he had been guilty of *contumacia* or *disobediencia*. Accordingly the old stringent process, and the *adilectum* in which it ended, though it became less frequent, still continued throughout the course of Imperial Rome, and even down to the time of Justinian. The private prison, with unfulfilled debtors working in it, was still the appendage to a Roman moneylender's house, even in the third and fourth centuries after the Christian era, though the practice seems to have become rarer and rarer. The status of the *adilectus* debtor, with its peculiar rights and obligations, is discussed by Gaglian, (vii. 31); and *Julius Gellius* (A.D. 145) observes—"Adilecti namque sunt et vinculi nomine videtur, quia vinculo sunt penitus detentum hominum carcerem". (vii. 1.)

If the *Adiudex Solvitur* was assigned to several creditors, they were obliged by the Twelve Tables to divide his body among them. No example was known of this power having been ever carried into effect, but the law was understood to give the power distinctly.

It is useful to have before us the old Roman law of debtor and creditor, partly as a point of comparison with the modern Roman practice in *Actio*, partly to illustrate the difference shown in an early state of society between the claim for the principal and the claim for the interest.

See the Abhandlung of Von Savigny in the Transactions of the Berlin Academy for 1815, p. 79-100; the subject is also treated by the very admirable expounder in his *System des heutigen Römischen Rechts*, vol. v. sect. 18, and in *Rechtsgri.* 18, 21 of that volume.

The same peculiar stringent process, which was available in the case of an action for pecunia oris mutui, was also specially extended to the *stipulatio*, who had paid down money to liquidate another man's debt; the debtor, if insolvent, became his *adiudex*—this was the *Actio Depositi*. I have already remarked in a former note, that in the *Actio* law, a case analogous to this was the only one in which the assigned remedy against the person of the debtor was always maintained. When a man had paid money to redeem a citizen from captivity, the latter, if he did not repay it, became the slave of the party who had advanced the money.

Walter (*Gelehrte des Römischen Rechts*, sect. 381-318, 3nd ed.) calls in question the above explanation of *Von Savigny*, on grounds which do not appear to me sufficient.

How long the feeling continued, that it was heinous and indelicate to render any interest at all for money lent, may be seen from the following notice respecting the state of the law in France was drawn to 1793—

"*Levent le Révolution Française (de 1789) le pout à l'abolition d'un fait par également étendu dans les diverses parties du royaume. Dans les pays de droit écrit, il était permis de stipuler l'intérêt des deniers prêtés; mais la persécution des peulonniers atteignait souvent à son comble. Souvent le droit consacré des pays coutumiers, ou se permettait stipuler l'intérêt tel qu'il pour le pout appelé au droit coutumier. On touchait pour maxime que l'argent ne produisant rien par lui-même, on tel pout devant être gratuit: que la persécution d'intérêt était une chose: il est après on admettait avec généralité les principes de droit coutumier. De même, la législation et la jurisprudence venaient souvent les lois. Mais et surtout la nature des intérêts et des obligations." (Cassini, *Lois despotiques*, ou *Lois, Décrets, Ordonnances*, Paris, 1843; Note sur*



le Décret de l'Assemblée Nationale concernant le Pôt et l'intérêt, Août 11, 1789.)

The National Assembly declared the legality of all loans on mortgage, "selon le taux déterminé par la loi," but did not then fix any special rate. "Le décret du 11. Août, 1789, défendit le vente et l'impôt de rétroite." "La loi du 8 floréal, an vi., déclara que l'us l'argent sont marchandises ; mais elle fut répétée par le décret du 2 germinal suivant. Les articles 1884 et 1887 du Code Civil permettent le prêt à intérêt, mais au taux fixé ou autorisé par la loi. La loi du 5 sept., 1807, affecta le taux d'intérêt à 5 par cent, en matière civile et à 6 par cent, en matière commerciale."

The article on Lending-money, in Peckham's History of France (vol. III. pp. 1-44), is highly interesting and instructive on the above subject. It traces the gradual rising in question, mitigation, and disappearance of the ancient scruples against taking interest for money ; an scruples long mentioned by the ecclesiastics as well as by the jurists. Lending-money, or *Monte de Piété*, were first commenced in Italy about the middle of the fifteenth century, by some Franciscan monks, for the purpose of raising poor borrowers from the servilement condition of the Jews : Pope Pius II. (Eneas Silvius, one of the allies of the Popes, about 1444-1448) was the first who approved of one of them as lawful, but even the papal sanction was long evaded by a large proportion of ecclesiastics. At first it was to be purely charitable ; not only neither giving interest to those who contributed money, nor taking interest from the borrowers—but not even providing fixed pay to the administrators : interest was totally taken, but the popes were a long time before they would formally approve of such a practice. "At Vienna, in order to appease the reproach of avarice, the articles were employed of not demanding any interest, but admonishing the borrowers that they should give a remuneration according to their piety and ability." (p. 11.) The Dominicans, partisans of the old doctrine, called these establishments *Montes Leprosos*. A Franciscan monk, Bernardino, one of the most active promoters of the *Monte de Piété*, did not venture to demand, but only to secure as an unavoidable evil, the payment of wages to the clerks and administrators : "*Spemulatus et sollicitatus Bernardino Bernardino fuit, ut aliquis illis penitus deinde et proinde pauperum decorem et commoditatem illis penitus, sed plus quam et pauperum sollicitudo, wages de decorem tempore. Nec minus (impulsi) tunc ut order beneficium, ut gubernatores et officiales, Montem montem necessarii, vellet laborum hanc amorem gratia solvere : quod et remunerandi non ex parte principalis, vel ipso legem, non*

with Martinian spirit, level education, at Jesuitical opportunities total palpable religious abuse profit.] (p. 12.)

The Council of Trent, during the following century, pronounced in favour of the legitimacy and usefulness of those lending-banks, and this has since been understood to be the sentiment of the Catholic Church generally.

To trace this gradual change of moral feeling is highly instructive—the more so, as that general basis of sentiment, of which the sympathy against lending money on interest is only a particular case, still prevails largely in society and directs the current of moral approbation and disapprobation. In some nations, as among the ancient Romans before Cæsar, this sentiment has been carried so far as to repudiate and despise all buying and selling. (Horvick. l. 188.) With many, the principle of reciprocity in human dealings appears, when considered in theory, odious and contemptible, and goes by some bad names, such as *aggravation*, *retaliation*, *calculatedness*, *political economy*, &c., the only sentiment which they will admit in theory, is, that the man who has, ought to be ready at all times to give away to him who has not; while the latter is encouraged to expect and receive such gratuitous donation.

## CHAPTER XII.

## EPIROA—CYCLADES.

Among the Ionic portion of Hellas are to be reckoned (besides the islands Athens) Eubœa, and the numerous group of islands included between the north-western Eubœan promontory, the eastern coast of Peloponnesus and the north-western coast of Epirus. Of these islands some are to be considered as outlying prolongations, in a south-easterly direction, of the mountain-system of Asia; others, of that of Eubœa; while a certain number of them lie apart from either system, and seem referable to a volcanic origin.<sup>1</sup> In the first class belong Eubœa, Kythira, Seriphia, Platingion, Sikina, Gyaros, Spira, Poros, and Antiparos; to the second class, Andros, Tinos, Mykonos, Delos, Rhos, Anargos; in the third class, Skiathos, Milos, Thira. These islands passed amongst the ancient by the general names of *Cyclades* and *Sporades*; the former denomination being commonly understood to comprise those which immediately surrounded the sacred island of Delos,—the latter best-applied to those which lay more scattered and apart. But the names are not applied with uniformity or steadiness even in ancient times: at present, the whole group are usually known by the title of *Cyclades*.

The population of these islands was called *Ionic*—with the exception of Spira and Karpates in the southern part of Eubœa, and the island of Kythira, which were peopled by *Drytians*,<sup>2</sup> the same title as those who have been already remarked in the *Argolic peninsula*; and with the exception also of Milos and Thira, which were colonies from Sparta.

<sup>1</sup> See *Strabo*, *De Asia*, lib. 10.  
<sup>2</sup> *Strabo*, lib. 10, p. 47.

<sup>3</sup> *Strabo*, lib. 10, p. 47.

The island of Rhodes, long and narrow, like Kos, and resembling a continuous backbone of lofty mountains, runs north-west to south-east, interrupted from Rhodes at one point by a strait so narrow (celebrated in antiquity under the name of the Eurypus), that the two were connected by a bridge for a large portion of the historical period of Greece, crossed during the later times of the Peloponnesian war by the inhabitants of Chalkis.<sup>1</sup> Its general west of breadth leaves little room for plains. The west of the island consists principally of mountains, rock, shell, and waste, suited in many parts for pasture, but mostly unsuited for grain-culture or towns, habitations. Some plains there were, however, of great fertility, especially that of Lebentum,<sup>2</sup> bordering on the sea near Chalkis, and continuing from that city in a westerly direction towards Akroia. Chalkis and Akroia, both situated on the western coast, and both occupying parts of this fertile plain, were the two principal places in the island: the domain of each seems to have extended across the island from sea to sea.<sup>3</sup> Towards the northern end of the island were situated Rhodion, afterwards called Oros — as well as Karistion and Dion: Arkadon, Daidon, Edipura, Sige, and Orosion, are also mentioned on the north-western coast, over against Lokris. Dynia, Sigea, and Karystos are much known to us in the portion of the island south of Akroia — the two latter opposite to the little towns Hala Amphipolis and Pseira.<sup>4</sup> The wide extent of the island of Rhodes was thus distributed between six or seven cities, the larger and central portion belonging to Chalkis and Akroia. But the extensive mountain lands, applicable only for pasture in the summer — the most fertile lands, but not for pasture to such proprietors as had the means of providing winter sustenance elsewhere for their cattle, — were never visited by any one except the shepherds. These

<sup>1</sup> Deane and St.  
<sup>2</sup> *California, Urena*, ad Deane.  
1881, with *Opuntia* var. *Thompsonii*  
+ 1881, Thompson, *Bot. Plant. 1*,  
St. Louis, *Thompson* in *Western*  
*World*, vol. 1, 1881, p. 184, etc.  
The passage of *Thompsonii* in the  
Social and *Edwardsii* several parts of  
the western of America.

Hyacinth is opposite to Euphorbia, the tendency of which must therefore have furnished a nucleus of the eastern coast of England, as well as the western. The indigenous only extending to the interior — *Hyacinthus*, *Veronica*, *Quercus*, and *Ulmus*.

1. *Monograph, Geography, Map 100, p. 100.*  
 2. *Monograph, Geography, Map 100, p. 100.*  
 3. *Monograph, Geography, Map 100, p. 100.*





city. The military force of Boetia was not much inferior, for in the temple of the Amargyrian Artemis, nearly a mile from the city, in which the Boeotians were in the habit of marching in solemn procession to celebrate the festival of the goddess, there stood an ancient column setting forth that the procession had been performed by no less than 3500 hoplites, 600 bowmen, and 80 chariots.<sup>1</sup> The date of this inscription cannot be known, but it can hardly be earlier than the 40th Olympiad or 600 B.C.—near about the time of the Boeotian Iphidamant. Chalcis was still more powerful than Boetia: both were in agriculture governed by an oligarchy, which among the Chalcidians was called the Hippobatoe or Karsakeleroi—proprietors probably of most part of the plain called Lakonia, and employing the adjoining mountains as summer pasture for their herds. The extent of their property is attested by the large number of 4000 Kithrae or out-farmers, whom Athens quartered upon their lands, after the victory gained over them when they assisted the expelled Hippias in his efforts to regain the Athenian sceptre.<sup>2</sup>

Confining our attention, as we now do, to the first two centuries of Grecian history, or the interval between 776 B.C. and 500 B.C., there are scarce any facts which we can produce to ascertain the condition of these Ionia islands. Two or three circumstances, however, may be named which go to confirm our idea of their early wealth and importance.

1. The Homeric Hymn to Apollo presents to us the island of Delos as the centre of a great periodical festival in honour of Apollo, celebrated by all the cities, islands and continental, of the Ionic name. What the date of this hymn is, we have no means of determining. Theocritus quotes it without hesitation as the production of Homer, and doubtless it was in his time universally accepted as such—though modern critics quarrel in regarding both that and the other hymns as much later than the Iliad and Odyssey. Yet it cannot probably be later than 600 B.C. The description of the Ionic visitors presented to us in this hymn is

<sup>1</sup> But the extent and wealth of the Boeotian plain probably makes for their carrying provisions to distant parts, which seems implied in the account of the procession.

<sup>2</sup> Herod. l. c.  
<sup>3</sup> Herod. v. 77; *Antiquities*, *Preparations and Retardation of War*, p. 111.—112; *Geography*, *Attica*, p. 16, l. 2.

spirited and unspiced. The number of Greek ships, the display of their navy, the beauty of their women, the athletic exhibitions, as well as the matches of song and dance—all things are represented as making an indelible impression on the spectator: "the assembled Ionians look as if they were beyond the reach of old age or death". Such was the magnificence of which Delphi was the periodical theatre, calling forth the voices and passions of not merely of Hionian lands, but also of the Delian maidens in the temple of Apollo, during the century preceding 500 B.C. At that time it was the great central festival of the Ionians in Asia and Europe; frequented by the twelve Ionian cities in and near Asia Minor, as well as by Athens and Chalkis in Europe. It had not yet been superseded by the Ephesus as the Ionian festival of these Asiatics: nor had the Panathenæa of Athens reached the importance which afterwards came to belong to them during the glories of the Athenian power.

We find both Polykrates of Samos and Peisistratus of Athens taking a warm interest in the mastery of Delphi and the celebrity of her festival.<sup>1</sup> But it was partly the rise of these two great Ionian despots, partly the conquests of the Persians in Asia Minor, which broke up the independence of the numerous petty Ionian cities, during the last half of the sixth century before the Christian era; hence the great festival at Delphi gradually declined in importance. Though never wholly interrupted, it was shorn of much of its previous greatness, and especially of that which constituted the first of all ornaments—the crowd of joyous visitors. And Thucydides, when he notices the attempt made by the Athenians during the Peloponnesian war, in the height of their naval supremacy, to revive the Delian festival, quotes the Hymn to Apollo as a certificate of its former and long-forgotten splendour. We perceive that even he could find no better evidence than the hymn, for Greek transactions of a century anterior to Peisistratus—and we may therefore judge how imperfectly the history of the

He deduces  
about the  
A.C.—years  
thence.

<sup>1</sup> Herod. Hymn. Apoll. l. 661—674: *Ἰωνες γὰρ καὶ ἑσπερὶ γῆρας, κλεινὸν δὲ* Thucyd. II. 64.

*ἡ δὲ ἰσχυρία καὶ ἀφύπναις ἄνευ.* "Ἄνευ" <sup>ἰσχυρία</sup> *ἀφύπναις*, *ἀνὰφύπναις* in

*ἡ δὲ ἰσχυρία* described in Thucyd. II. 64. *Ἄνευ* <sup>ἰσχυρία</sup> *ἀφύπναις*, *ἄνὰφύπναις* in Thucyd. II. 64.



period was known to the men who took part in the Peloponnesian war. The hymn is exceedingly precious as an historical document, because it alludes to as a transitory "gift" and extensive association of the Ionic Greeks on both sides of the Aegean Sea, which the conquests of the Lydians lost, and of the Persians afterwards, overthrew—a time when the hear of the wealthy Athenian was decorated with golden ornaments, and his table made of linen,<sup>1</sup> like that of the Milesians and Ephesians, instead of the rough softer costume and woollen clothing which he subsequently copied from Sparta and Peloponnesians—a time too when the Ionic seems had not yet contracted that stain of effeminacy and corruption which stood imprinted upon it in the time of Herodotus and Thucydides, and which grew partly out of the subjugation of the Asiatic Ionians by Persia, partly out of the supremacy of the Peloponnesian Dorians to Athens. The author of the Homeric hymn, in describing the proud Ionians who thronged in his day to the Delian festival, could hardly have anticipated a time to come when the name Ionian would become a reproach, such as the European Greeks, to whom it really belonged, were desirous of disclaiming.<sup>2</sup>

2. Another illustrative fact is reference both to the Ionians generally, and to Chalkis and Euboea in particular, during the century anterior to Peloponnesus, is to be found in the war between these two cities respecting the fertile plain Lelantine<sup>3</sup> which lay between them. In general, it appears, these two important towns maintained harmonious relations. But there were some seasons of dispute, and one in particular, wherein a formidable war ensued between them, several allies joining with each. It is remarkable that this was the only war known to Thucydides (anterior to the Persian conquest) which had risen above the dignity of a mere quarrel between neighbors; and in which so many different states manifested a disposition to interfere, as to impart to it a semi-Hellenic character.<sup>4</sup> Respecting

<sup>1</sup> Thucyd. i. 2, note 3; Aristotle, *de* *Republica* i. 10. Of the war between the Milesians and Ephesians, Herodotus speaks at length, *de* *Republica* i. 10. Thucydides, *de* *Republica* i. 10. Thucydides, *de* *Republica* i. 10. Thucydides, *de* *Republica* i. 10.

Herodotus, but not equally significant in regard to the matter. Thucydides, *de* *Republica* i. 10. Thucydides, *de* *Republica* i. 10. Thucydides, *de* *Republica* i. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Thucyd. i. 2. The second Macedonian war is the only one which is

the allies of each party on this occasion we know only, that the Ephians lent assistance to Eretria, and the Thracians, as well as the Phoenicians and the Chalcidians colonies at Thurii, to Chalcis. A plaque, still visible during the time of Strabo, in the temple of the Hecateopitilium, *Asclepias* near Eretria, recorded the agreement entered into mainly by the two hellograecia, to abstain from murder, and to employ nothing but hand weapons. The Eretrians are said to have been superior in arms, but they were vanquished in the battle: the tomb of Hieronymus of Phocæia, a distinguished warrior who had perished in the name of the Hecateopitilium, was erected in the agora of Chalcis. We know nothing of the date, the duration, or the particulars of this war; but it seems that the Eretrians were worsted, though their city always maintained its dignity as the second state in the island. Chalcis was decidedly the first, and continued to be flourishing, populous, and commercial, long after it had lost its political importance throughout all the period of Grecian independent history.

3. Of the importance of Chalchic and Electra, during the seventh and part of the eighth century before the Christian era, we gather other evidence—partly in the numerous colonies founded by them (in which I shall dwell in a subsequent chapter),—partly in the prevalence throughout a large portion of Greece, of the Echols scale of weights and money. What the quantities and proportions of this scale were has been first shown by M. Bechth in his "Metrologia". It was of Eastern origin, and the gold collected by Darius in tribute throughout the vast Persian empire was ordered to be delivered in Echols talents.

1. **Identify the main idea**  
 2. **Identify the supporting details**  
 3. **Identify the conclusion**  
 4. **Identify the evidence**  
 5. **Identify the counter-evidence**  
 6. **Identify the author's bias**  
 7. **Identify the author's purpose**  
 8. **Identify the author's tone**  
 9. **Identify the author's style**  
 10. **Identify the author's audience**

There is no evidence of any significant difference in the mean values of the two groups.

<sup>1</sup> Brown, 1982, p. 446; Marshall, p. 10; Pridemore, 1982, p. 103—citations by the author are in italics.

Marble passed over from Italy, to the New York residence of the Countess, where celebrated by the name of Ann, she was in company of Lord Beauchamp, Gilbert, and gained a triumph as prize by winning an elegant ring. The lady, according to the reports, afterwards was able to choose who preferred to be the war cabinet, and the minister.

**Education.** Ted B. argues that Plutarch shows that the Jews are apostate, though he acknowledges Jewish history as a vigorous example of Jewish life. This was *Sanhedrin* (Kaplan, *Chofetz Chaim*, p. 107).

This view of Huxley as Cuvier's true representative as the voice of his postulated competition with and victory over Lyell goes to the *Cochranes* (May 1863, p. 101) and (1863).

<sup>2</sup> See the striking description of cheating given by O'Donnell in the film, *Badly Dressed*, p. 149, n. 10.

Its divisions—the talent equal to 60 minas, the mina equal to 100 drachms, the drachm equal to 6 obols—was the same as those of the scale called *Sigmas*, introduced by Pericles of Argos. <sup>2</sup> But the six obols of the Eretrian drachm contained a weight of silver equal only to five *Sigmas* obols, so that the Eretrian denominations—drachm, mina, and talent—were equal only to five-sixths of the same denominations in the *Sigma* scale. It was the Eretrian scale which prevailed at Athens before the debasement

introduced by Solon; which debasement (amounting to about 20 per cent., as has been mentioned in a previous chapter) created a third scale called the *Attic*, distinct both from the *Sigma* and Eretrian—standing to the former in the ratio of 5 : 4, and to the latter in the ratio of 18 : 15. It seems plain that the Eretrian scale was adopted by the Ionians through their intercourse with the Lydians<sup>3</sup> and other Asiatics, and that it became naturalized among their cities under the name of the Eretrian, because Chalcis and Eretria were the most actively commercial states in the *Sigma*—just as the superior members of *Sigma*, among the Doron states, had given to the scale introduced by Pericles of Argos the name of *Sigma*. The fact of its being so called indicates a time when these two Eretrian cities surpassed Athens in maritime power and extended commercial relations, and when they stood among the foremost of the Ionic cities throughout Greece. The Eretrian scale, after having been debased by Solon in exchange to obols and money, still continued in use at Athens for merchandise. <sup>4</sup> The *Attic* merchants were retained its primitive Eretrian weight.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, l. 10.

<sup>3</sup> See Herodotus' *Historia*, v. 2 and 3.



